

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>O</sup>. CXL. *JULY* 1910.

---

ART. I.—KING EDWARD THE SEVENTH.

MORE than two months have passed since we heard in quick succession of the illness and death of the King. The first shock—and how great it was—has passed, and it is beginning to be possible to consider with more circumspection the character of the loss we have sustained.

In the presence of death, whether of rich or poor, of prince or subject, it is impossible to analyze that which is felt. By the open grave the universal feeling of mankind requires that the voice of criticism and judgement should be silenced. Especially is this the case when a personal friend has died, and nothing was more remarkable than the manner in which this personal sense of loss was created by the death of King Edward.

Without any exaggeration we may say that when the King died every member of the community of which he was the ruler and leader felt that he had lost a personal friend. It is this power which he had of arousing sympathy, of impressing his personality on the minds of millions of men and women to whom he was, and could be, scarcely more than a name, by whom he had been seen once and again as a swiftly passing figure among crowds of attendant soldiers and the paraphernalia of a royal cavalcade, which seems to us perhaps the most remarkable of his qualities. To find the secret of it we must look first to a quality which, simple as it is, is too rare in this world. A genuine kindness of heart which is interested in the fortunes and misfortunes of all, which wishes well to them not from any

philosophical principle, but because of the natural and unspoilt spirit of common humanity tempered and guided by the teaching of Christianity. To find this quickness of sympathy, this kindness of disposition, this heartiness of appreciation in anyone is one of the rarest pleasures of life. How much is this intensified when the man who displays it is not merely one who sits on the throne, but one who also has shewn himself capable of taking full draughts of the cup of life.

The King's reign was not a long one, but in it he had succeeded in awakening a wealth of genuine personal attachment and respect which would hardly have been anticipated at his accession. His strong, virile, genial, robust personality had come to be a real part in the corporate life of the nation, and also in the individual interests of each member of it.

Many have at times looked with apprehension and regret at the zest with which the King enjoyed the pleasures of life. Let us recognize that this very capacity for enjoyment added much to the King's popularity and that there was much in it which was good. We live in an age and a nation in which the power of enjoyment has been perhaps underestimated. Through how much of the writing of modern times, through how much of the life of men and women at the present day, half acknowledged, imperfectly understood, runs a note of pessimism. The example of the King left no doubt as to one matter—as he felt so he made others feel, that life was worth living. Thousands of men and women, themselves debarred from those advantages which he enjoyed to the full, found the secondary pleasure in the consciousness that he enjoyed them.

There is, indeed, no greater fallacy than to suppose that the poor look with jealousy on the pleasures of the rich; they look on rather with sympathy so long as the rich do not close their hearts to sympathy with the sorrows of the poor.

The power of enjoyment, the healthy interest in life, is indeed almost a necessary condition of success in a



position such as that which King Edward was called to fill. It was closely connected with another quality which was so characteristic of him, a quality which was most conspicuous in the way in which he carried out his royal duties—what we may call his effectiveness. There are few men who have done what they had to do with such conspicuous ease, confidence, and success. His part in the world was not an easy one to play—curiously limited, strangely vague, with untold powers of subtle and indirect influence, yet kept out from that practical immediate task of creative action which is the most agreeable occupation of an ordinary healthy-minded man. There is no doubt, however, that what he had to do he did strongly, confidently, effectively. In recognizing this we come at once across one of the most remarkable characteristics of hereditary monarchy. There have indeed been many bad kings, there have been many weak and inefficient ones, yet on the whole, if we look down the roll of sovereigns either in this or any other country, surely it must be acknowledged that they have filled their post with more success than might have been anticipated when it is remembered that they have in nearly every case owed their position to what is called the accident of birth. There have, of course, been times when for some generations a throne has been occupied by men in character and ability notoriously unfitted for it—a most conspicuous case is that of the French Bourbons; when this has happened they have brought down with them the monarchy or the country. Generally speaking, however, the very fact that kings have been born to their position has tended to create and preserve in them the essential qualities of kingcraft.

Strength, courage, decisiveness, sense of honour, a sense of public obligation, all these are helped by self-confidence, the self-confidence which springs from the feeling that the position that a man holds belongs to him absolutely as by right. We see the same quality in a great aristocracy. Men born into a position of power and responsibility, trained and prepared for it from their earliest years, can undertake their duties with a fearlessness, a confidence, and in consequence very often an honesty, which is more difficult

for those who have to fight for, to win, and to maintain their position. A man can never do his best when he has to be deferential, apologetic. Fearlessness and steadfastness in action is difficult for those who know that they hold their position merely by tolerance, that at any moment there are dozens of others with an equal right and with perhaps more ability to step into their places. Do we not see something of the effect of this in the lives of politicians? We must put aside, indeed, the few men of supereminent ability—the Chathams, the Bismarcks, the Gladstones. These are men who are in truth not by birth but by character and ability the rulers of the nation. They fear no competitor, for they recognize no equal. They may be displaced from office, but in power or in disgrace they always stand beyond the others. There is an interesting passage in Lord Randolph Churchill's *Life* in which that very shrewd and critical observer noted that talking to Mr. Gladstone was like talking to a member of the Royal Family. One felt the same absolute line of demarcation, the impossibility of equality. One felt, he said, as if one were talking to a person of another class. These men can act in politics with a confidence and power of which smaller men are incapable. Something of the same quality may be found also among certain other politicians, but it will be found among them only because they have been born to the position. Of these the late Lord Salisbury is one of the best examples. For him and for how many other English ministers is the same thing true. It may be said that his political career gained a large portion of its success because it was the one to which he was born. To a special degree is this true of monarchy.

We hear now much about heredity: observers of exceptional ability are investigating the hidden secrets of nature and attempting to determine in what way the qualities of the individual are passed on from generation to generation. It is tempting for bolder speculators at once to apply to human society the discoveries which have been made. One thing is often forgotten, that among human beings the qualities which are mostly to be desired can to a large extent



be created by the circumstances in which a man is placed. A country such as England has inherited from a distant past great institutions, and the experience of innumerable generations has shewn that these institutions are suitable for nurturing certain qualities the preservation of which is necessary for the welfare of the state. The secrets of government, the traditional rules of conduct, the highest sense of honour and obligation, are handed on from generation to generation by placing each generation as it is born in circumstances and surroundings so arranged and disposed that these qualities are absorbed unconsciously from the earliest years. Of these institutions the Church, as it is the earliest, so is also the greatest ; with it we have the whole structure of government, we have the universities and the great schools. It is the crown which is the head and symbol of this aspect of the national life. It is a constant reminder to the nation that national life is not a thing merely of yesterday and to-day ; the forms of government are not things which can be changed and altered by each generation in accordance with some passing phase of public opinion, the irresponsible whim of a clever rhetorician. It was this capacity for founding permanent institutions which was the great strength of what we call the Middle Ages. The shallow and superficial liberalism (continental rather than English in its origin) which prevailed fifty years ago would have condemned these institutions as useless and obstructive because their full meaning and value were not understood.

Can we deny that a very large portion of the popularity of the late King arose from some such cause as this. We are getting accustomed to the ineffectiveness of politicians. We do not expect them each man individually to do the best that is in him. We know that each one acquiesces in much that he disapproves, does badly much that he could do well and would like to do well if the opportunity were given. He has not the opportunity, for he is merely the temporary and passing *locum tenens*. He is not identified with the place that he holds, often scarcely identified with the policy that he defends. To this is due that general ineffectiveness in execution and that indefiniteness in principle which marks

so much of our history. This is what we call 'muddling along.' It is supposed that things generally come out right in the end. As a matter of fact this is not true. They often come out very badly in the end. No one can exaggerate the injury which is done to the best interests of the nation as a whole and individuals of which it is composed by this want of effectiveness.

More than this, it is a spectacle which men look on with distaste, if not disgust. We all wish to be proud of that which concerns us ; we should like to see the government of the country conducted with sense, courage, and discretion. We should like to look with respect and confidence on those who hold the highest offices.

There is a great pleasure in the contemplation of anything done well, finished complete, done with style, pleasure, and thoroughness. It is one which in politics we do not often enjoy. There is a great pleasure in seeing a man hold a position with the full confidence that it is his absolutely by nature and by right, and completely identify himself, his thoughts, his actions, with that position ; doing so not because gain and advantage may come to him from it, but rather satisfying himself by spending the whole of his life and energies in it. It is something of this feeling which the King aroused among his subjects. He had not asked to be made king, the office came to him as by natural right ; but being king he threw himself into the duties of his post with a whole-hearted devotion, and carried them out with singular effectiveness.

It is a great thing for the welfare of a nation that men in the highest places should do well their work, whatever it may be. Whether or no it is desirable to have a king and to maintain the pomp and circumstance of royalty is a matter on which different opinions may be held. There is no doubt that in a nation which has this it should be well done. Indolence, carelessness, indifference, sluggishness, slovenliness—all these things affect the whole life of the people. That the ceremony of which the king is the centre should always be carried out with dignity, with precision, with thought and intelligence, encourages similar qualities



throughout people. If we are to have a king we require a king who will see that these things are well done. Especially is this necessary in England at the present day, when too often slackness is supposed to be an indication of cleverness and indifference to form to shew superiority.

When people see that a man manages his own household well, they believe that he is likely to be a good guardian of the affairs of the nation. It is an old truism, but is none the less valid unto the present day. It would be absurd to attempt a final judgement as to the political influence of the late King. Many years must elapse before we know the full truth as to the share which he took in advising and guiding the foreign affairs. This we can see, that from the time of his accession there was brought into this department of the state a spirit of strong and vigorous common sense, genial, cordial, unaggressive, ready to be friends with all other nations, to extend to them the same quick sympathy, kindliness of disposition, and readiness of understanding which he shewed in dealing with his own people. It may be true that he had little power in determining the details of the policy, it is undoubtedly true that he did much to create the atmosphere of goodwill and mutual confidence without which a peaceful foreign policy cannot be maintained, and yet everyone knew that he would be no party to the surrender of any of the essential interests of this country.

There is no quality which earned for the late King so much the respect of all sensible men as this, that he knew how to keep himself before the world without that vulgarity of ostentation which in these days is so often associated with great wealth and great position. Simple as this may seem at the time, in the retrospect it is worthy of comment. He never obtruded his opinions where they would be out of place, he never displayed that feverish unrest, that desire for applause, the anxiety to be observed and talked about, which is now so common. The best things he did were done in secret, and he exemplifies the truth of the saying that the man who wishes to achieve something in this world must not desire that men shall give him the credit for it.

It was his fortune to die when the politics of the country had become entangled in a maze from which no outlet was visible. There are two great parties in the state each led by men of distinguished character and ability, and yet it may be said that neither leader really enjoys the confidence even of his own followers. Each party is carried along by an apparently uncontrollable force, the one, it may be held, towards the destruction of those institutions which have been the birthright of Englishmen for six hundred years, the other, as it appears to many, to a hasty and reckless abandonment of the basis of commercial life and industrial prosperity. There seemed before the country no alternative but a series of violent oscillations each of which was probably distasteful to the great majority of Englishmen. There was a growing apprehension that in the violence of political warfare the real interests of the nation might be forgotten. More and more men were beginning to look to the King as a possible arbitrator between opposing factions, and to believe that he at least would not allow England to be forgotten in the cause of party. The work which it was hoped he might accomplish during his lifetime has been reserved till after his death, but the very effect of his death on the parties of the country shews how great a position there still is for Kingship which stands above party.

Of this his death does not deprive us. Men come and go, but the institutions continue. Of the new King not much was known except this, that he was united to his father by exceptional ties not only of that filial affection which has too often been wanting between a monarch and an heir-apparent, but also of a close personal friendship which is in all ranks of life rare between men of different generations.

It is no romantic fancy if we look with more confidence to the future of the nation, because we believe that the new King will worthily carry on the traditions which he has inherited from his father and his grandmother. We look with confidence to the future, because we know that he brings to the great task before him and to the great responsibilities laid upon his shoulders a strong, earnest, simple



sense of duty. We believe that he will keep the English court free from the vulgar craze for advertisement and the ostentation of wealth which are the bane of modern life, and we expect that the best and greatest things which he does will not be known during his own lifetime. We look with confidence to the future because we know that he has a wife brought up in the best traditions of English womanhood. George III boasted that he was a true Briton because he had been born in this country. For the first time now since the reign of Henry VIII England is ruled by a King and Queen both of whom are purely English in taste, in language, in nurture, in affection. We look with confidence to the future because we see growing up in the best form of simple family life children who will carry on to distant generations the traditions of the great examples of English Monarchy.

---

## ART. II.—REUNION AND THE CHURCHES OF SCANDINAVIA.

1. *Hugonis Grotii Epistolae quotquot reperiri potuerunt.* Editae per H. ET J. GROTIOS. (Amsterdam. 1687.)
2. *Handbok i Svenska Kyrkans Historia.* Af C. A. CORNELIUS, Biskop i Linköping. Tredje Upplagan. (Upsala: W. Schultz. 1892.)
3. *Jesper Svedbergs Lif och Verksamhet.* Af HENRY W. TOTTIE. (Upsala: Akademiska Boktryckeriet, 1885.)
4. *Skisser och Kritiker.* Af HERMAN LUNDSTRÖM. (Stockholm.)
5. *Handbok för Svenska Kyrkan.* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups Forlag. 1899.)
6. *Apostolical Succession in the Church of Sweden.* By the Rev. A. NICHOLSON, LL.D. (London: Rivingtons. 1880.)
7. *Vindiciae Arosienses. A Reply to the Treatise of the*

- Rev. A. Bernhard, Priest of the Roman Church, Stockholm.*  
By the Rev. A. NICHOLSON, LL.D. (London : Griffith, Farran. 1887.)
8. *Christian Dogmatics.* By H. MARTENSEN, D.D., Bishop of Sjaelland. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark. 1866.)
  9. *Forordnet Alter Bog for Danmark.* (Copenhagen. 1901.)
  10. *Den Danske Folkekirkes Bekendelsesskrifter.* Af A. TH. JØRGENSEN. (Copenhagen : G. E. C. Gad. 1900.)
  11. *Fortaellinger af Danmarks Kirkehistorie fra 1517 til 1843.* Af L. KOCH og H. F. RØRDAM. (Copenhagen : G. E. C. Gad. 1839.)
  12. *Kirkeleksikon for Norden.* Udgivet af Prof. FR. NIELSEN [continued by Prof. V. AMMUNDSEN]. (Aarhus : Jydske Forlag. 1901- .)
  13. *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion.* Holden at Lambeth Palace, July 27 to August 5, 1908. *Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the Resolutions and Reports.* No. XI. Report of the Committee appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Reunion and Intercommunion—(a) Episcopal Churches. vi. The Scandinavian Churches. (London : S.P.C.K. 1908.)

It may seem strange, that an article on Scandinavia should begin with Holland, but it is nevertheless the case, that the first suggestion of an ecclesiastical 'entente' between England and Scandinavia came from the famous Dutchman, Hugo Grotius, who in 1635 was appointed Swedish ambassador to the French court, and in that capacity resided at Paris for ten years. In early life he had visited England and made the acquaintance of Laud, Andrewes, and Overall. Then followed the troublous times, in which his patron, the Grand Pensionary Oldenbarnevelt, was executed, he himself was imprisoned for life, and the synod of Dort did its best to stamp out Arminianism in Holland. Not unnaturally he looked to his English friends for support and encouragement. Lord Scudamore, then English ambassador at Paris, thus writes to Laud :



'The next time I see ambassador Grotius, I will not fail to perform your commands concerning him. Certainly, my Lord, I am persuaded, that he doth unfeignedly and highly love and reverence your person and proceedings. Body and soul he professeth himself to be for the church of England, and gives this judgment of it, that it is the likeliest to last of any church this day in being.'

It was in the same spirit that Grotius wrote to his brother in the last year of his life, that the Anglican liturgy had always been considered the best by all learned men. By 1630 he had conceived the idea of a conference on Protestant Union, in which Britain, Denmark, and Sweden would come to terms, and hoped that the Dutch Remonstrants or Arminians would be included.<sup>1</sup> To John Duraeus he further expounds his ideas on November 21, 1637, as he had communicated them to the British ambassadors at Paris, that a general conference was out of the question, but that a political alliance between Britain and Sweden might well lead to an ecclesiastical alliance, and this would bring about further movements of unity and check the tendencies to disruption, which were only causing secessions to Rome.<sup>2</sup> He admired the English Reformation because of the respect for antiquity which it

<sup>1</sup> 'Posse et nunc auctore Britanno Dano Suedo conventum cogi ad pacem omnium Protestantium, qua facta nostrae controversiae silebunt. Nam si cum plenīs Lutheranis transigatur, nihil manebit certaminis cum Remonstrantibus, id est semi-Lutheranis. Scis enim ab omnibus Protestantium Academiis in Germania damnatos Dordrechtanos canones, eamque nunc praecipuam esse discidii causam, intermoriente prope apud omnes ubiquetario dogmate' (*Epistolae*, Amsterdam, 1687, 2nd ser. 240).

<sup>2</sup> *Epp.* 1st ser. 866. 'Egi etiam de re eadem cum ambobus ab Anglia hic legatis D. Comite Lcestrio et D. Scutamorio. Utrique videtur, ut et mihi, ut conventus instituatur omnium qui ubique sunt Protestantium, non ferre haec tempora, per quae illis ne pax quidem ulla communis humanae societatis constat inter se. Optimum igitur fore, ut sicut amicitia inter se iunguntur, brevi forte etiam iungentur federe, Suediae Britanniaeque Regna, ita et eorum Regnorum Ecclesiae suae concordiae edant professionem publicam, primumque vicinis Suediae Danis et Norwegis, deinde et aliis dent

had consistently maintained.<sup>1</sup> But the outbreak of the Civil War finally put an end to all these hopes, though he still cherished the wish that his own countrymen would revert more to primitive standards. Thus he writes to his brother regretting that there are not more in Holland who share John Corvinus' respect for antiquity. If there were, he says, he would urge them to select some of their number as bishops, and obtain consecration for them from the 'Irish Archbishop who is there.' Presumably he meant Bramhall, who however was only Bishop of Derry at the time, and did not become Archbishop of Armagh till the Restoration.

In the eighteenth century there was comparatively little intercourse between Swedish and English ecclesiastics. Our last ecclesiastical statesman, Bishop Robinson, the trusted adviser of Queen Anne, had been originally chaplain and subsequently ambassador at Stockholm, but his interests must have been more devoted to political than to ecclesiastical affairs. Jesper Svedberg, Bishop of Skara,

exemplum quod imitentur. Constituto semel aliquo tali Ecclesiarum corpore spes est subinde alios atque alios se aggregaturos. Est autem haec res eo magis optanda Protestantibus, quod quotidie multi eos deserunt et se coetibus Romanensibus addunt non alia de causa quam quod non unum est eorum corpus, sed partes distractae, greges segreges, propria cuique sua sacrorum communio, ingens praeterea maledicendi certamen. Quae quidem ut sanentur, referre Protestantium in tanta praesertim male ipsis volentium conspiratione, quis non videt ?

<sup>1</sup> To John Corvinus, May 28, 1638. 'In Anglia vides quam bene processerit dogmatum noxiorum repurgatio, hac maxima de causa, quod qui id sanctissimum negotium procurandum susceper, nihil admiserunt novi, nihil sui, sed ad meliora secula intentam habuere oculorum aciem.' Hallam (*Literature of Europe*, vol. ii., p. 314 ff.) would regard this as simply the utterance of a cryptopapist. One phrase of Grotius in a letter of Nov. 17, 1643 (2nd ser. 677) is sufficient to disprove that view: 'Nec torquere se debet, quod communione careat sine sua culpa. Deus id damnum spiritualibus donis repensat.' The Roman Church would have received with joy so distinguished a recruit, if he had felt anxieties and wished to relieve them. Mark Pattison (*Encycl. Brit.* s.v. *Grotius*) rejects the supposed 'bias towards popery.'



1702-1735, had visited England and conceived a great respect for our Church. He apparently expressed to Bishop Fell of Oxford his belief that there was such essential agreement between the Churches that it would be easy to remove the points of divergence. He was especially struck in this country by the strict observance of Sunday, the service of Confirmation, and the charitable institutions; but he found English preaching too rhetorical. It was he who appointed Jakob Serenius chaplain to the Swedish community in London in 1723, and the latter subsequently, when Bishop of Strengnäs (1763-1776), formally instituted Confirmation in his diocese, an example soon followed by other bishops, though the service did not appear in the Church Handbook till 1811.

A point of contact with Sweden was, however, found in North America. The Swedish colony on the Delaware River dated from 1637, and first passed into English hands in 1664. The language, Church organization and customs of the settlers were, however, maintained, under the supervision from home of Bishop Svedberg, who urged the Swedish priests in America to cultivate friendly relations with the English Episcopalians, and find in them 'a support against the many ultra-Protestant sects.' On the death in 1831 of the last Swedish clergyman sent out the congregations all joined the American Episcopal Church. During the nineteenth century the emigration to the United States from Sweden has assumed vast proportions and led to increased relations with our brethren in America. This is shewn by a passage from the preface to Dr. H. M. Mason's translation of Anjou's *History of the Reformation in Sweden*:

'The Protestant Episcopal or Catholic Church in the United States having passed a resolution and appointed a Committee of its General Convention to inquire into the expediency of opening an intercourse with the Church of Sweden, I have undertaken a translation of the work of Mr. Anjou as connected with that object.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> New York, 1859.

Some of the Lutheran congregations have entered into more or less close relations with the Episcopal Church. Bishop Whitehouse of Illinois formally recognized the orders of a Swedish pastor ordained by the Bishop of Skara, the Rev. J. Bredberg. With a view to closer relations the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States passed a canon in 1904, enabling a bishop to approve the use of services in a language other than the English language.

‘Under this the Bishops of that Church may license the use of the Liturgy of the Church of Sweden by any Swedish congregation, which may place themselves under their care, and this licence has in fact been given in several American Dioceses.’<sup>1</sup>

But those, who have remained aloof both from American Episcopalians and the mother-Church of their own country, have organized themselves in a more definitely Presbyterian manner. The Augustana Synod, organized at Chicago in 1860, is the chief of these bodies, and there are others, which represent more definitely still an antithesis to the official Church of Sweden. The Augustana Synod has indeed been visited in recent years by a Swedish bishop, but it is no secret that it does not wish to revert to episcopal government. However, it only accounts, it is said, for a quarter of a million out of a million and a half of Swedes in the United States.

In the earlier half of the nineteenth century occurred an interesting act of intercommunion. Confirmation was desired by a member of the English colony at Gothenburg for his children. Bishop Blomfield of London requested Bishop Wingard of Gothenburg to confirm for him, and this was actually done. The royal mandate permitting this is so interesting that it may be given in full.

‘Charles John, by the Grace of God, etc. Whereas on the 21st of March last you have represented that frequent application may now be made in the city of Göteborg for the rite of Confirmation; that although the English Factory there existing

<sup>1</sup> Report of Lambeth Committee, 1908, p. 182.



is furnished with a special minister, he, the aforesaid minister, is not empowered to perform the act of confirmation, which according to the statutes of the English episcopal church can only be done by a bishop; and whereas the Bishop of London under whose authority the aforesaid minister is placed, having denied him the right to confirm, has nevertheless found a Swedish bishop competent so to do; and whereas moreover a Mr. Nonnen, merchant of the city of Göteborg, being of the English nation and church, has made application to you for the confirmation of his daughter; and whereas you desire, that we would graciously allow Swedish bishops to confirm children belonging to the Church of England, according to the rules of the ritual of the Swedish church, provided the aforesaid children possess sufficient knowledge of the doctrine of salvation, together with the first rudiments of the Swedish language; by which gracious permission these our subjects would be spared the great inconvenience of taking their children to England for confirmation, without which the right of entering into the state of matrimony and other privileges cannot be obtained; and whereas finally you humbly advance that you for your own part would not scruple to fulfil such desire on the part of brethren in faith, the more so as evangelical tenets are more and more becoming united daily, and that you consider that the act of confirmation might be performed in such wise, that the English minister having caused the candidates, either in the presence of the congregation (which however is not customary in England) or of the bishop, to give proof of possessing the requisite knowledge of the facts prescribed, the examination might be conducted in the English tongue, the bishop performing the act of confirmation, according to the prescriptions of the Swedish ritual, reading the "Our Father," and using the laying on of hands in England considered essential; and whereas you desire that the confirmation, in order to avoid attracting public attention or causing disturbing assemblages of people, might be performed in the English Factory Church: Therefore in view of these things we have deemed good to grant you the right of confirming members of the Church of England in the manner humbly proposed, whenever application shall be made to you to that effect. We therefore graciously give you these in answer for your guidance. We graciously commend you to Almighty God.

CHARLES JOHN.

A. C. VON SKULBERG.

*'Stockholm Castle, 4 May 1837.'*

It is to be noted by way of comment on this document, that full liberty of the exercise of religion and permission to build churches had been granted to members of the English Church settled in Sweden as early as 1741, but that this goes much further, inasmuch as it assists Swedish subjects to retain their ecclesiastical position by the intervention of the Swedish Church. At this time, and indeed for some time afterwards throughout Scandinavia, the production of a certificate of confirmation was a condition of almost all civil appointments. A rudimentary knowledge of Swedish is no doubt required, because the Bishop was to perform the service in that language, and it was felt that the candidates should understand the substance at least of what was said. It is also significant, that no objection whatever was felt to the imposition of hands being thus introduced into the Swedish rite, though not then customary. This is a point to which we must return later. The mandate is still in force, but the need does not arise now that we have a bishop of our own for Northern and Central Europe.

A further act of intercommunion took place in 1866. Bishop Whitehouse of Illinois was then commissioned by the Bishop of London to consecrate the newly built English Church at Stockholm. The Primate of Sweden, Archbishop Reuterdahl, attended the service vested and took part in it by delivering an address and pronouncing the Benediction.<sup>1</sup>

In 1880 Archbishop Tait and Bishop Harold Browne called the attention of the Bishops of the Southern Province to the Orders of the Church of Sweden.

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 for the first time made definite overtures to the Swedish Church. The report of the Committee runs thus :

‘ In regard to the Swedish Church, your Committee are of opinion that, as its standards of doctrine are to a great extent in accord with our own, and its continuity as a national Church has never been broken, any approaches on its part should be most gladly welcomed with a view to mutual explanation

<sup>1</sup> See *Colonial Church Chronicle*, 1866, p. 334.



of differences, and the ultimate establishment, if possible, of permanent intercommunion on sound principles of Ecclesiastical polity.'

As this was not officially communicated, it had no effect, but in 1895 an American Committee reported adversely on Swedish Orders to the General Convention of the Church in the United States. The report of the Lambeth Committee of 1897 refused to endorse these objections, and resolution 39 of the Conference reiterated the desire for friendly discussion. A great step forward was made by the appearance of a member of the Swedish episcopate, the Bishop of Kalmar, at the Lambeth Conference of 1908, bearing a Latin letter from the Archbishop of Upsala containing the words :

'Laetamur quod Vos, Episcopi Anglicani, iam pridem spectatis, ut Ecclesiam vestram et nostram inter se societate quadam devinciatis. Id quibus in rebus et quo modo fieri possit, deliberetis velim, cum Henry William Tottie, episcopo Calmariensi, collega meo carissimo.'

This was the first intimation that the present Archbishop (consecrated in 1901) had given of his attitude in the question, and it is very gratifying to find that the advances our rulers have made have been received in so friendly a spirit.

The matter has been still further advanced by the visit to Upsala of the Bishops of Winchester and Salisbury, with the Bishop of Marquette (U.S.A.) to represent the American Church, accompanied by Canon Mason, who has long been interested in the Scandinavian Churches, and Chancellor Bernard of Salisbury. Their visit is fully reported in the *Guardian* of October 20, 1909. They were received with the greatest courtesy and friendliness, as befitted a Commission appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in accordance with the wish of the Lambeth Conference. The royal family shewed special kindness and sympathy ; the public interest in the occasion was profound ; and the warmth of the welcome from the Commission appointed

to receive them and discuss matters with them was most marked. The Archbishop of Upsala, and the Bishop of Kalmar, both formerly professors in the University of Upsala, the newly appointed Dean of Upsala, Dr. Herman Lundström, a learned Church historian, and ten present and former members of the Cathedral Chapter, took part in the meetings on the Swedish side. On the first day the episcopal succession in the two Churches was discussed; on the second the Diaconate and Confirmation, the authority of the Augsburg Confession and the other formularies, Eucharistic doctrine, and the relations between the Church of Sweden and other Lutheran bodies; on the third the ecclesiastical position of the Swedish settlers in America. The Archbishop of Upsala has now nominated a permanent Committee to correspond with the English Commission. The members are, beside himself, Bishop Tottie of Kalmar, Bishop Ahnfelt of Linköping, Dean Lundström, and Professor Söderblom. Thus for the first time the two Churches are brought into full and official contact.

English Churchmen have entire confidence in the wisdom and discretion of their representatives. Haste has certainly not been exhibited so far, and is not likely to be exhibited in the future; but whatever be the outcome, what has happened must be a matter for congratulation. Should the only practical result affect our brethren in the United States, it would be a considerable gain. But a good deal more may be anticipated. In the first place let us deal with the subject of the first day's discussion, the succession of the Swedish Episcopate. One result of the Conference will certainly be the establishment of that as an historical fact. We all remember how Archbishop Temple in his trenchant way declared that Apostolic Succession was not a doctrine but a fact. There is reason to believe, though it has not been stated publicly, that our representatives are quite satisfied about Swedish Orders. The late Dr. F. S. May,<sup>1</sup> one of the very few Englishmen who knew Sweden well, was convinced on this point, and devoted a great part

<sup>1</sup> His articles on the subject will be found in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for 1861.



of his life to promoting friendly relations with the Scandinavian Churches. Dr. Nicholson, in a pamphlet published in 1880 but unfortunately out of print,<sup>1</sup> declared that Apostolical Succession was proved for the Swedish Church on precisely the same grounds on which it is accepted as proved for the English Church. Apart from questions of 'intention,' and any objections that may be raised to mon-episcopal consecrations, which apply equally to the consecrations of St. Augustine and to the Old Catholic Church of Holland, the matter can be briefly summarized as follows. Gustavus Vasa at his accession requested of the Pope the consecration of four ecclesiastics, who had been elected by the Cathedral Chapters to the vacant sees. One such consecration was forthwith performed at Rome on May 1, 1524, that of Peter Magnusson, a monk of Vadstena, then resident at Rome. At the order of the King he consecrated three bishops to three other vacant sees in 1528 without Papal confirmation. His epitaph, preserved by the Roman Catholic historian, John Messenius, records his regret at having thus given a Lutheran succession,<sup>2</sup> and hence clearly Messenius, writing in the middle of the seventeenth century, could not dispute the fact that the succession had been maintained. All these consecrations, as well as that of Laurentius Petri, who was Archbishop of Upsala for over forty years, on September 22, 1531, were performed with the full ancient ritual. It is well said of him, that when he came to the primacy, he found the Church of Sweden mediaeval though not Papal; when he died, he left it Reformed but not Protestant. The attempt of Gustavus to limit the power of the hierarchy and reduce the Church revenues, to which ends in 1539 he appointed a Pomeranian, George Norman, as a sort of Swedish Thomas Cromwell, was practically

<sup>1</sup> This pamphlet ought to be reprinted, along with his *Vindiciae Arosienses*, 1887, a reply to Fr. Bernhard, a Roman priest in Stockholm. A few copies are or were to be obtained from the Anglican and Foreign Church Society.

<sup>2</sup> Per me sacratus non paucus Episcopus extat,  
Quorum nonnulli deseruere fidem :  
Inde Lutheranis procrevit Clerus in orbe  
Suecorum ; mentem sauciat idque meam.

abandoned owing to the outbreak of a serious rebellion, the Dackefejd, in 1542.

Laurentius<sup>1</sup> Petri's successor as Archbishop was another Laurentius Petri distinguished from the first by the name Gothus. He was consecrated on July 14, 1575, 'according to the complete Catholic use,' by special order of the then King John III, who was a decided High Churchman. His consecrator was Paulus Juusten, Bishop of Åbo, who had himself been consecrated by Bishop Bothvid Sunonis. Owing to a fire at the cathedral of Strengnäs, the register, which would have contained the account of the latter's consecration, is lost, but there is, as in the case of our own Bishop Barlow, abundant contemporary evidence shewing that he was duly consecrated, and no Roman controversialist of that or the following century ever contested the fact. It is inconceivable that John III, who insisted on the use of chrism in the consecration of the Archbishop, should have chosen as consecrator one whose Orders were under suspicion. John himself, though quite willing to discuss differences with Rome, seems to have held the same sort of ecclesiastical position as our Queen Elizabeth, who was, however, less free to consider theoretically questions of Reunion. The reign of Sigismund, who became a Roman Catholic and was also King of Poland, very naturally brought about a Protestant reaction under Charles IX, but the latter's Calvinistic tendencies had as little success as the opposite views of his predecessor, and from the accession of Gustavus Adolphus in 1611 there has been singularly little change in the position of the Swedish Church. While retaining episcopal insignia (pectoral cross, mitre, pastoral staff), vestments (chasuble and cope), altar-lights, wafer-bread, the crucifix, the sign of the cross,<sup>1</sup> it has been strongly

<sup>1</sup> The name 'priest' is ordinarily given to a Scandinavian clergyman. It has always been in popular use, as *e.g.* in Northumberland with us. Emphasis has been laid on preaching as the first and foremost function of the priest, but this has never put out of sight the ministry of the sacraments. 'To proclaim God's pure word and duly administer His sacraments' is the order in Scandinavian formularies.



Evangelical and scriptural and in doctrine has adhered to the lines laid down by Luther. Its orthodoxy is marked by the assent it requires from ordinands to the three creeds; they likewise subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, as explained in the *Liber Concordiae*.<sup>1</sup> To what extent the latter is regarded at the present day as of importance, is a point on which we shall expect, and no doubt receive, further information. In the Augsburg Confession Melancthon only protests against what he considers modern abuses, and does not attempt to lay down the complete lines of Church polity. On the principle that what is not forbidden is not excluded, the Church of Sweden could restore the Diaconate to-morrow. It is a point, on which doubtless there would be difference of opinion in Sweden to-day. We should probably find it difficult to convince them of the utility of the Diaconate as we have it—a brief period of a year, absorbed in all kinds of activities, without leisure for study. Still, it is the one important point in which they may be said to have departed from the standards of the historic Church.

As to Confirmation the matter is a little more complicated. In the Baptismal service, before the actual affusion, the priest recites the Lord's Prayer with imposition of hands. It may be that imposition of hands is not prescribed, though it is permitted, at Confirmation for this reason. The service as prescribed in the Handbook is headed, 'Of the First Communion of the Young,' but the word Confirmation is used in a note. There is always careful instruction in Christian doctrine beforehand, and at the

<sup>1</sup> However, the second of the questions put by a Bishop at ordination runs as follows: 'Will you constantly abide by the pure evangelical doctrine, even as it, founded in God's holy word, the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is received and explained by the unaltered Augsburg Confession and the resolution of the Synod of Upsala of 1593, so that you will neither openly promulgate and disseminate nor secretly advance doctrines in opposition thereto?' (*Handbok för Svenska Kyrkan*. Lund, 1899). The Upsala Synod may be said to end the Reformation period in Swedish history.

service some questions are asked. The Apostles' Creed is then used exactly as in our Baptismal service, and then the formal permission to become communicants is given. This is followed by the prayer: 'May the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might through His Spirit in the inner man and filled with all the fulness of God.' A congregation is assumed to be present and parents and sponsors are expected to attend. The minister of the rite is of course the priest who has prepared the candidates, not the bishop. There is a conspicuous absence of the expression in our service 'renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your name at your Baptism, ratifying and confirming the same.' It is simply pointed out, that the faith in which they have been examined is the faith into which they were baptized. As in Germany at the time the dominant view was that held by Spener, that Confirmation is the subjective renewal and confirmation of the Baptismal vow, it is certainly remarkable, that the Swedish bishops who introduced the rite in the course of the eighteenth century did not emphasize this aspect of it more. Certainly both Svedberg and Serenius were chiefly influenced by the English practice. The wording of the prayer above suggests that a new grace is desired of God and expected in the rite. The natural conclusion to one inspecting the formularies is that through the rite the confirmands are strengthened by the Holy Spirit on the principle of St. Matt. xxi. 22. No doubt the Swedes would not formally allow a sacramental character, and yet it seems as if they were almost compelled to look in that direction, as they carefully avoid making it simply a public profession of faith. Logically, it seems as if they were bound ultimately to adopt imposition of hands. To us it cannot seem important, that the rite is not administered by a bishop. It must be referred to expert theologians, what is the bearing on the question of the imposition of hands practised at Baptism.

The Swedish Church teaches the Real Presence most emphatically. In the Liturgy (*Högmässan*) we notice the *Agnus Dei*, and there are alternative formulae at distribution,



either 'Christ's Body, for thee given' and 'Christ's Blood, for thee shed' or 'Jesus Christ, whose { Body } thou receivest, preserve thee to everlasting life.' Communion is usually preceded by a common office of Confession and Absolution. The form of the latter is :

'If this your confession of sin is sincere, and you thus with penitent hearts desire forgiveness of your sins for Jesus Christ's sake, it is certain and sure, by virtue of God's word and promise, that He graciously forgives you all sins; and the forgiveness of these your sins I announce to you by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

There is also an office called 'Of individual Confession and Absolution,' which is really intended to relieve of excommunication on declaration of penitence any notorious offender, and assumes the previous disclosure of the particular sin. The Form for Consecration of a Bishop is described quite fully in the report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference. The only point there omitted is, that apparently the assistants of the Archbishop need not necessarily be bishops. 'The Archbishop and the assistants lay their hands upon the Bishop's head, and the Archbishop prays: "Our Father . . ."' This liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer is very marked. It is used in the ordination of bishops and priests, at the institution of a parson, at Baptism along with imposition of hands, and at Confirmation with or without the latter. It immediately follows the words of institution at the Eucharist, and is the most prominent part of the services for marriage, consecration of a church or of a cemetery. This is most typically Lutheran and goes back to the earliest Lutheran ritual of 1539: '*Ordinatio ministrorum verbi. Quinto, Tunc impositis manibus totius presbiterii super capita eorum, dicat Ordinator clara voce orationem dominicam.*' We may surely add, that it is a most beautiful and interesting feature of the usages of this National Church.

The Bishop of Salisbury has pointed out, that the

obedience of Sweden to Rome only lasted about 400 years altogether. Grotius, in writing to Baron Oxenstjerna, says :

‘I remember hearing from Swedes, that even before this disruption, which is troubling the Christian world, the power of the Bishop of Rome was slight in Sweden. It reminds me of the words of Tacitus: “*Laudatorum Principum usus ex aequo, saevi proximis ingruunt.*”’

It is certainly the case, that the distance and the great difficulty in early days of communication with Rome made the connexion mean much less than in southern Europe, and the spirit of independence in the north was stronger than elsewhere. The leaders of the Reformation were natives, chief among them being the brothers Olaus and Laurentius Petri, both great and wise men, who preserved their independence even against the King, when they disagreed with him. The conservatism of the Reformation is shewn by the fact that, while the first breach with Rome came about at the Diet of Vesterås in 1527, the celebrated monastery of Vadstena was not suppressed till 1595, though of course its inmates were a centre of opposition to the Reformation. But Sweden was doubtless proud of the memory of St. Birgitta and the order of Birgittines she had founded. It is much to be wished, that some competent scholar would give us an account in English of that remarkable woman, whose Revelations were once so famous.

Another very special reason for our interest in Sweden is the large share that England took in its conversion. Next to Ansgar came St. Sigfrid, an English missionary, who baptized Olof Skötkonung, King of Upsala, about 1007 A.D. With the King’s hearty co-operation, he evangelized the West Goths, the result being the diocese of Skara, which was ruled by three Englishmen in succession from 1077. The martyrdom of his three nephews, Unaman, Sunaman and Winaman, led to the evangelization of Småland and the foundation of the diocese of Wexiö. The apostle of the southern province Skåne, then belonging to Denmark, was Bernhard, an Englishman, and Henry,



Bishop of Orkney, was the first Bishop of Lund. The evangelist of Vestmanland was an English monk called David, who is regarded as the founder of the diocese of Vesterås. At the same time St. Eskil was martyred while laying the foundation on the other side of Lake Mälär of the present diocese of Strengnäs, and his successor was Botvid, a Swede, who had been baptized in England. In fact, it may be said that it was the pressure exercised from our own country that finally broke down the power of heathenism in the north. And now we have once more the opportunity of entering into closer relations with a country in which sound learning and real piety are closely united. If without vanity we may hope that our influence will be good for them, we may equally feel that they will have much to teach us.

But while the preservation of the succession in Sweden facilitates the resumption of official relations, we must not forget that there are two other Scandinavian countries, in which also England was much interested in early times and ought still to feel an interest to-day. The history of the Norwegian Church down to the Reformation has been written in a very interesting book by the Rev. T. B. Willson,<sup>1</sup> and the same subject of the English missionary work has also been dealt with by Mr. A. Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*. The early influence of England in Denmark was also considerable and has been dealt with by Miss Ellen Jørgensen in a book published by the Danish Royal Academy of Sciences in 1908, *Fremmed Indflydelse under den danske Kirkes tidligste Udvikling* ('Foreign influence in the earliest period of development of the Danish Church'). The Reformation was brought about in Denmark and Norway by the accession to the throne of the worthless Christian II, who had already been ejected from Sweden, of the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp as Frederick I, 1523, who was acknowledged as King in Norway, 1524. His son, Christian III, in 1536 by a *coup d'état* imprisoned the bishops, and summoned Bugenhagen from

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Church and State in Norway from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century*. By T. B. Willson. (Constable and Co. 1903.)

Germany, who consecrated seven new superintendents on September 12, 1537, though himself only in priest's orders, the archbishopric being abolished and the see of Sjaelland removed from Roskilde to Copenhagen. The title of Bishop was soon restored, but with this exception the old order was changed both in Denmark and Norway, though in remote parts and especially in Iceland the changes were violently resisted.<sup>1</sup> The succession was lost deliberately in Denmark and Norway, because the sovereign would have it so : it was retained in Sweden, because the sovereign was determined to retain it. There are no differences to-day between Denmark and Norway ecclesiastically, that are worth mentioning. The outward aspect of things in Denmark is much the same as in Sweden. If anything, there is more Church life. The leading tendency is that of the ' Indre Mission ' and strongly Evangelical. But the traditions of the great Bishops Mynster and Martensen<sup>2</sup> have not died out, and the new Primate, Dr. Madsen, till recently Professor of Systematic Theology at the University, to some extent represents them. The Danish services are not nearly so full as those of Sweden, but they are essentially on the same lines. One notices that the imposition of hands is used at Confirmation,<sup>3</sup> that a Bishop consecrates a Bishop, while priests join in the imposition of hands, and that at the ordination of priests the Bishop says to the ordinand :

<sup>1</sup> Bain, *History of Scandinavia* (Cambridge, 1904), Chapter V.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Hamilton's *Sixteen Months in the Danish Isles* (2 vols., London, 1852) was dedicated to Bishop Mynster and contains a chapter on Danish Church life at that time. S. Laing (*State of Denmark*, 1851) is less sympathetic. Reference may also be made to the article on ' The Church in Denmark ' by Lic.-theol. C. E. Fløystrup of Copenhagen (*C.Q.R.*, April, 1907).

<sup>3</sup> A new rule has now been made authorizing the omission of the oral examination at Confirmation. This of course tends to remove the character of a test of admission pure and simple, and to give a semi-sacramental complexion to the rite, which is headed ' Konfirmation ' ; and this is followed by ' Forbøn for de unge som skulde konfirmeres,' i.e. prayer for the young people, who are to be confirmed (*Forordnet Alter Bog for Danmark*, Copenhagen, 1901).



‘ Thus now I transmit to you the holy office of priest and preacher, according to apostolic practice, in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, with power and authority hereafter, as a right servant of God and Jesus Christ, to preach God’s word both privately and publicly, to administer the venerable sacraments according to Christ’s own institution, to bind sins upon the refractory and to loose them for the penitent, and all else that belongs to this your holy calling, according to God’s word and the order of our Church. Amen.’

Those ordained subscribe to the three creeds, the Augsburg Confession, and Luther’s little Catechism. The latter is taught in elementary schools, and there is an authorized edition of it with some notes by Bishop Balslev. It contains a simple explanation, ‘ such as a master of a house might give to his household,’ of (1) the Decalogue, (2) the Apostles’ Creed, (3) the Lord’s Prayer, (4) the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, (5) the Sacrament of the Altar. The well-known *Dogmatics* of Bishop Martensen may probably be regarded as the most authoritative exposition of Danish Theology. Those who have read its fifth section on ‘ The Doctrine of the Spirit ’ are aware how he endeavours steadfastly to hold a ‘ *via media* ’ between the Roman and extreme Protestant positions, as in the following passage :

‘ Scripture and Tradition stand in indissoluble and reciprocal relation to each other, and “ what God hath joined together let no man put asunder.” We behold the severing of Tradition from Scripture in the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, . . . a tradition running to seed . . . which formed a religious labyrinth, out of which the Reformers succeeded in finding their way, only by the help of Holy Scripture, and the old oecumenical tradition. If, on the other hand, Scripture be separated from Tradition, there ensues that merely spontaneous subjective use of Scripture, which we see variously in the Protestant Church, that *iudicium privatum* which considers not only that the symbols of the Church are beset with relative imperfection, but that now, apart from all presuppositions, it must again be made the subject of inquiry what Christianity is.’

A few other extracts will shew his position in detail.

‘ In the Sacraments the deepest mystery rests in the truth

that in them Christ communicates Himself not only spiritually but in His glorified corporeity.' 'The Lutheran doctrine regarding the Lord's Supper rests neither upon a Dualism between nature and grace (Calvin) nor upon a transformation of the one into the other (Rome), but upon an inner marriage of the heavenly and the earthly substance.' 'We in the Evangelical Church recognize Confirmation and Penance Orders and Marriage as holy acts, which when undertaken and performed in faith with prayer and invocation bring a divine blessing with them, and may deservedly be called "means of grace." . . . They bear the relation to Baptism and the Lord's Supper of the derived to the original.' 'Baptism and the Lord's Supper . . . are fundamental pre-suppositions and conditions of the Church's development, her union with the Lord depending upon them; whereas those other five are only products of this development. With these convictions the Evangelical Church, though from the beginning she has through Melanchthon asserted ordination and penance to be of the nature of Sacraments—an application of the term, which may certainly be maintained by the usage of the early Church, without in any way necessarily sanctioning the Romish view—has nevertheless by degrees given up this wide application of the word.'

A school of nineteenth-century Lutherans in Germany has gone further than this, as may be seen from the following :

'We may regard it as certain that the German Reformation agreed entirely, so far as the reality of ordination is concerned, with the Roman teaching on ordination, *viz.* that it is a solemn consecration whereby the ordinand receives the extraordinary gifts which are requisite for the sacred duties of the office to which he is appointed.'

'Man kann getrost behaupten, dass die deutsche Reformation, was die Realität der Ordination betrifft, vollständig mit der Römischen Lehre von der Ordination übereinstimmt, wonach diese eine feierliche Weihe ist wodurch der Erwählte die ausserordentlichen Gaben erhält, die zu den heiligen Verrichtungen des Amtes, wozu er berufen ist, nothwendig sind.'<sup>1</sup>

Of course this would not receive general endorsement in Scandinavia to-day. Thus the present Primate of

<sup>1</sup> F. Pfeiffer, *Der Kampf der hessischen Kirche um ihre Freiheit* (1874).



Denmark, Dr. Madsen, in a Program of Copenhagen University, 1904, takes a decidedly low view of ordination; yet even he takes his stand on the New Testament word 'separate,'<sup>1</sup> and says it is an evident misjudgement of ordination to call it an 'adiaphoron' or 'res indifferens,' as German Lutherans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often maintained. The following extracts from Martensen are worthy of notice<sup>2</sup>:

'Confirmation is not an ordinance of the Lord's, but must be regarded as a work of the Spirit in the Church.' 'Confession meets a deep need of human nature . . . it is a matter of regret, that private confession, as an institution, meeting as it does this want in a regular manner, has fallen into disuse; and that the objective point of union is wanting for the many, who desire to unburden their souls by confessing not to God only but to a fellow-man, and who feel their need of comfort and of forgiveness, which any one indeed may draw for himself from the gospel, but which in many instances he may desire to hear spoken by a man, who speaks in virtue of the authority of his holy office.' 'Although the Lutheran Church has not ventured to propound a dogma regarding priestly ordination, owing to a certain fear of the hierarchical principle, the faith nevertheless exists within her pale that ordination is more than a mere ceremony, as it is also the express witness of faithful ministers, that they have ever derived new strength and energy for the work of their office in their ordination.' 'Regarding the power of the keys (Matt. xvi. 9, xviii. 18; John xx. 23) . . . orderly Church discipline cannot be exercised as it ought by the minister alone, but must be exercised by him in union with the Church (1 Cor. v. 4).'

It may be said by way of criticism on Lutheranism, that it lays too much stress on the congregation (*Samfund, Menighed, Gemeinde*); but as a matter of fact, there is no tendency to Congregationalism anywhere present, at least as we understand it, and there is a good deal of support in primitive Church history for what we might perhaps think to be doubtful language. These extracts at least shew,

<sup>1</sup> Acts xiii. 2, 'Indvielse der fulgte efter kaldelsen,' *i.e.* ordination following upon vocation.

<sup>2</sup> The quotations are taken from the English translation of 1866 which is rather accurate than elegant.

that if the Danish Church of to-day preserves at all the spirit of Martensen—and if the so-called ‘High Church tendency’ (*højkirkelige Retning*)<sup>1</sup> is not so strong as it was, it is certainly fully represented—there is at least nothing to prevent our making friendly overtures to Copenhagen too. In fact, the best way in which we could convince our Swedish friends that our present attitude is solely dictated by a longing to help in restoring the lost unity of Christendom, is by letting them know, that though the difficulties are greater where the succession is lost, we are equally interested in and have an equal sympathy with the neighbour-nation which is ecclesiastically so closely akin to themselves, and in which, through our own royal family, we are so deeply interested. The same remark applies of course to Norway. Throughout their history these kingdoms have had perpetual differences. A common creed is the one thing that has softened the bitterness since the Reformation. For the sake of a wider unity they might possibly be willing to draw still closer together. The Lambeth Committee’s Report reads thus: ‘Your committee are aware that the Churches of the three countries are quite independent of one another, but they believe that a closer approach to one of them might favourably affect our relations with the others.’

One point remains to be noticed. Both in Denmark and Sweden we find the advantage and disadvantage of Establishment. So far as an outsider can judge, however, the disadvantage is, as it was from the first, much greater in Denmark than in Sweden. The Crown in Sweden to-day is a benevolent patron of the Church, with a legitimate and not undue voice in election and patronage<sup>2</sup>—our

<sup>1</sup> ‘High Church’ in Denmark signifies a conservative and Lutheran standpoint. The movement, which was started by Bishop Grundtvig, emphasized the importance of the historic creed (the Apostles’ Creed was regarded by him as the Lord’s own word), but did not end in laying emphasis on Church order and sacraments, and the modern Grundtvigianer are rather hostile than otherwise to ecclesiastical order.

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, it seems probable, that in the course of this year, the direct influence of the Crown will, by general consent, be greatly diminished. An account of the changes, which will probably be

own condition is infinitely worse than theirs—and it is tolerably clear, that assent would not be refused to any change which the Church as a body wished to bring about, unless it were of a revolutionary nature. In Denmark, the Church, having been absolutely under the thumb of the Crown for centuries, is now treated even worse by a Parliament, which is largely hostile to it. The period for which the Parish Councils Act was passed is now expiring, and the present Parliament seems determined not to renew it. A large and influential commission to draw up a Church constitution sat for a lengthy period and came to definite conclusions. The late Primate Bishop Skat Rørdam, a most learned and able man, and the lamented Church historian, Bishop Fredrik Nielsen, were the leading members of that commission, and if they did not get all they wanted, were at least fairly satisfied with its results. The present Parliament refuses to do anything to give legal effect to their draft proposals. Of course, the next election may diminish the power of the Socialists and extreme Radicals. But it is tolerably obvious, that Disestablishment is as menacing in Denmark as in England. Hitherto the Church of Denmark has been truly national, in that it has comprised all the religious life of the nation, with exception of a small minority of Roman Catholics. But Disestablishment would probably let loose separatist forces. Then would come a time of trial, when English sympathy and support might be of considerable value. Above all, at the present time we ought to take some trouble to cultivate friendly personal relations with Danish and Swedish clergy. They visit England far more often than we go to them on our travels. We might well imitate them and make occasional visits to these countries in our holidays, with the determination of getting to know

accepted by the Church Congress (Kyrkomöte) this autumn, will be found in the Report of the Anglican and Foreign Church Society for 1909. The Kyrkomöte has a right of veto on all measures of Parliament affecting Church matters with which it is not satisfied, and has already exercised this veto in this question of appointment to livings.



them better. At present undenominational Christian associations are sure to throw them into contact with English Nonconformists. Now, from all that has been said hitherto, it ought to be obvious to any one, that we have really far more in common with them than the bulk of English Nonconformists. We must shew that we wish to cultivate their friendship and really regard them as Christian brethren. We must not be surprised if even to-day we find the erroneous impression among them that we are out-and-out Calvinists ! We of the English Church have always in the past been classed by Lutherans with the ' Reformed.' Such influence is needed to foster the Catholic spirit among them, which has never indeed died out, but has been much overlaid with prejudice. A letter recently received from a Danish pastor contains the following :

' The one thing needful is a determined stand upon old principles, a revival of the apostolic and first centuries Christianity, a strenuous pastoral work with zeal for winning souls to Christ, a firm belief in the self-sufficiency of the Church and the Spirit, without looking too much to the State, but with a firm belief that we can still hold the affection of the people and be of good help to them.' .

Secondly, we must fully recognize the importance in these days of the complete orthodoxy of both Churches. We must not expect to find every detail exactly what we approve. If this were so, there would be no need for any approximation. We ought to think whether we have ourselves completely defined everything as to doctrine and ritual to our own unanimous consent, and if we look first to what we are agreed upon, consider whether there is much that separates us from the Scandinavians. The loss of the succession in Denmark and Norway is a real difficulty. Here our wisest ecclesiastical statesmanship is needed. But can we refuse to them what we offer to the *Unitas Fratrum* ? Whether they accept or no, depends on the way in which we offer. If we fully acknowledge the difficulties of the Reformation period, and simply base our appeal on the needs and aspirations of the twentieth century, God in His own good time will bring about the desired result.

Finally, let us remember what Bishop Gaul recently said about some intimate relations he had had in the past with members of the Roman and Eastern Churches :

‘ I would suggest that these definite *acts* of union will be no unimportant factor in creating the *fact* of unity. To some they may at times seem irregular, but we cannot believe in our priesthood and in the necessity of the Sacrament without at least claiming their *validity*.’

The validity of our ministrations is not likely to be denied by our northern cousins. Can we not invite them to our altars here in England ? Were our Rubrics for one moment intended to apply to foreigners ? If the Bishop of Winchester celebrates in a Swedish Church at Upsala, is served by a Swedish priest and communicates him, may we not be permitted, without prejudice to official discussions on Intercommunion, similarly to demonstrate our longing for closer fellowship at home ? Will this not do as much as any amount of negotiation in removing that which is sectional and imperfect on both sides ? We shall not thereby really be abating one jot of our own belief in the Church and its sacred ministry.

‘ Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on Me through their word ; that they may all be one ; even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us : that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me.’

It is just because the world does not yet believe that God sent His Son to save it, that we feel this earnest longing after more visible union. It is quite natural that some should feel an objection to Intercommunion in one direction, as making advances in another direction more difficult. The only reply to that is, that the Spirit of God must be at work in these as in other matters, and that the will of God is manifested in the breaking down of barriers and the removal of impediments. When the time is ripe for action, we can but say with St. Peter, ‘ Who was I, that I could withstand God ? ’

G. C. RICHARDS.

## ART. III.—EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA.

1. *The Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia.* (Melbourne: Malcolm Bird and Co. 1909.)
2. *The Progress of Australasia in the Nineteenth Century.* By T. A. COGHLAN and T. T. EWING. (Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers. 1903.)
3. *The Growth of Empire.* By A. W. JOSE. (London: J. M. Dent and Co. Ltd. 1909.)
4. *The British Empire—its Past, its Present and its Future.* By A. F. POLLARD. (London: League of the Empire. 1909.)
5. *Australian Life in Town and Country.* By E. C. BULLEY. (London: George Newnes, Ltd. 1905.)
6. *Church Year Book for the Dioceses of Adelaide, Melbourne, Gippsland, Wangaratta, Bendigo and Ballarat.* (Adelaide: Church Office. Melbourne: Diocesan Registry. 1909.)

And other Works.

[The following article is published as representing impressions formed by the writer during several years' work in Australia, and he is alone responsible for the opinions expressed.—ED. C.Q.R.]

## I.

THE New World takes education seriously. It sees therein its main hope for the future. If numbers are small, efficiency must be the more anxiously sought. The rising generation must be armed for the conquest of Nature, competent to seize every new chance and ready to use every fresh invention. In Australia leaders of public opinion are conscious that something was lacking in the intellectual and moral stamina of early settlers—for in 1850 out of a total population in the continent of 78,000 more than 30,000 had come as convicts. But if education is demanded, it does not follow that a free community of modern birth sets much store by religious teaching. The democratic atmosphere



encourages payment for what it values, and that is ability in the practical business of life. It has not yet learnt that even from that standpoint character is the most abiding possession. It will not pay for the teaching of religion. There is an indistinct feeling that the Church is part of the supposed feudal anachronisms of the Old World. And, after all, the wrangling religious bodies have never been able to agree as to the type of religion they wish to have publicly taught.

Religion, therefore, as part of the recognized curriculum, is given no place in Government or State schools. It must be worked in, as opportunity serves, by voluntary agents outside the school hours. In secondary education there are many denominational schools, with chapels and daily services; and the Universities are largely composed of denominational colleges, with their own places of worship. The greatest work in primary religious instruction is done by the Roman Catholics. Other bodies, speaking broadly, rely on the devoted, but not very scientific, efforts of Sunday schools. There have been opportunities at certain critical times to win the battle for Universal Religious Instruction, if Anglican and Roman Catholic leaders could have joined forces. They could not. And there was no sufficiently dominating personality on the Anglican Bench of Bishops to shape and carry through a consistent policy. The tale is one of dissension and indecision, Synods and Bishops changing their objection year by year, so that a South Australian Premier was justified in replying to a deputation—'When all you religious bodies can agree as to what you really want, we will earnestly consider your proposals.'

Five years ago the aim of the Anglican Church in Victoria was the introduction of what is known as the New South Wales System. This works well in the Mother State. The Bible is taught by the teachers themselves and religious instruction is given by ministers or accredited agents of any denomination to children whose parents desire it. Parents, it is found, rarely raise objection. And the principle works out in the community giving the general basis, while all extras are provided by voluntary help. This is the system which

Dr. Pain, Bishop of Gippsland, after many years' experience in Sydney, recommended so strongly to the *Spectator* as a basis of settlement for England. Yet the financial support given to the Religious Instruction Fund in Sydney Diocese has been scarcely more than £500 a year from offertories and subscriptions, which cannot be counted a strong response. Supposing that in every state ministers were allowed to take classes in all schools, it is hard to see that they could compass the work. The heaviest burden would fall upon the Church, for Wesleyans and Congregationalists are slow to avail themselves of such opportunities. Roman Catholic priests would entirely decline : some help might be had from Presbyterians.

In 1905 an alternative scheme was put forward by New Zealand bishops. Schools were to be opened every day with recitation of the Lord's Prayer : during two half-hours each week the regular teachers were to give lessons from one of the four Gospels taken consecutively. There was to be a conscience clause for both teachers and scholars, providing that wherever teachers were unwilling to give such instruction, or where parents of children desired that the instruction should be given by a minister . . . leave should be given.

In Victoria it has been allowable for all ministers of religion to teach the Bible—without special doctrinal comment—for half an hour one day a week, before or after school hours. This also is the law in South Australia. Considerable use has been made of the facility. It is less than what Archbishop Benson recommended as the ideal to a former Bishop of Adelaide—'Never to rest satisfied till the truths of religion and the regular curriculum were taught by the same person.' But it is something. Its steady use helps to prove that the representatives of the Church are in earnest in their public demands, and it promotes good feeling between clergy and the children of the district.

By careful organization when there is strong backing of lay opinion much can be made of this opening. The present writer knows of a case in the suburbs of Melbourne where the 3600 children of three State schools had to be cared for. A

band of sixteen male and female teachers was organized; four Anglican clergy, two Presbyterian, two Congregational ministers with Sunday-school superintendents and teachers, gave a weekly half-hour to the work. Seeing that the classes were often over 120 strong, it was well that the law compelled the attendance of the State teachers for the sake of discipline. Very much naturally in such a case depends upon the sympathy of the head master, whose duty it is to find out from each parent whether there is any objection to the instruction being given. He can be hostile, or he can exercise influence to encourage attendance. There can be no doubt of the value of such a work as this in a populous suburb. It modifies the whole feeling of the district towards the Churches, for the energy and self-sacrifice it entails cannot be hidden. Moreover, where good order is kept and children are receptive, much can be taught in four half-hours a month.

This illustration will serve to shew the strength of the forces making for religion in the schools. Various leagues have come into existence for this end, but have probably been weakened by their comprehension of undogmatic sects, and of bodies hostile to all Church doctrine. Thus the power of 'The Bible in States Schools League' was wrecked by a two months' controversy in the public press on 'The Virgin Birth' and the 'Evidence for the Resurrection.' Congregational ministers were prominent in denying the necessity for belief in either. The opportunity was naturally seized by such an acute Roman ecclesiastic as Archbishop Carr of condemning the fatuity of entrusting the teaching of religion to men who denied the cardinal points of the Faith. Many Anglicans sympathized with the Archbishop, however much they regretted that this tactical point had been given away just when the people had been invited to decide by a Referendum between Secularism and Religion. Yet Secularists and Roman Catholics would not have won the battle of 1905 in Victoria without the help of political trickery and electioneering wile. An actual majority of voters, it was proved, was in favour of giving some religious instruction.

But the politicians were controlled by Roman Catholic



wire-pulling. They succeeded in repeating the plan of campaign which had been so successful in South Australia eight years previously, when Mr. Kingston was Premier. And in this way. Three questions were framed to be submitted to the people, each of them to be answered by a 'Yes' or 'No.' The first was: 'Are you in favour of the Education Act remaining secular as at present?' If the answer 'No' was given, it might imply that the voter wanted the system of school fees brought back. A huge majority therefore answered 'Yes.' They did not see that 'secular' meant 'devoid of religious instruction.' They understood that they were voting for the retention of the 'free and compulsory' system only. This was proved by the answers given to question No. 2. A majority answered 'Yes,' to—'Are you in favour of such legislation as shall cause the Scheme of Scripture Lessons recommended by the Royal Commission on Religious Education to be taught in State schools during school hours to children whose parents desire the teaching?' And the third question had also an affirmative majority—'Are you in favour of the Prayers and Hymns selected by the Royal Commission being used?'

But the politicians decided that the last two answers were nullified by the first, and the cause of religion was defeated in Melbourne as it had been in Adelaide. It was a victory for Romanism. And the Roman communion has shewn statesmanlike foresight of the first order. Its self-sacrifice on behalf of its own schools is beyond praise. The only terms upon which it will consent to religion being taught in State schools are that public grants are made to all sects. Then their schools, which with such persistence have been kept open, would be subvented and no other religious body would have at all the same amount of machinery ready. This is the danger which the ultra-Protestant party has so much in view. But hitherto Roman statecraft has managed to keep the key of the position.

This accentuates the importance of the quite recent Referendum in Queensland. The youngest and most democratic of all the Australian States has given a strong decision in favour of the New South Wales system. That decision

can hardly fail of receiving legislative ratification, and the example will then in all probability be followed by South Australia and Victoria.

It is undeniable that in the last few years the tide of feeling has set largely in favour of religion. The Royal Commission appointed in New South Wales to inquire into the causes of the decreasing birth rate asked that the Churches should be solicited to use their moral influence towards a betterment. Chief Justices have frequently commented in severe terms in criminal trials on the utter absence of the religious sense and on the ignorance of the word 'God' in witnesses. The most powerful democratic paper of South Australia, owned by Sir Langdon Bonython, a strong Wesleyan, has completely changed its tone and now recommends the adoption of the New South Wales system. For Voluntary Church schools have not been able to accomplish much. Roman Catholics indeed, in one State alone—Victoria—can spend £34,000 in educating 28,000 scholars in 200 schools. That is an index of their energy throughout the Commonwealth. And they can prohibit children from attending State schools under pain of excommunication. The Anglican Church has made but meagre provision for the same class. The 90,000 nominal Church people of South Australia can only raise some £200 a year towards the education of 1200 children in thirty schools. Among these the Kilburn Sisters are managing the most successful. And yet it is lamentably true, as many trust deeds bear witness, that in the early days of colonization land was usually given for the erection of a Church *and School*—a trust which has been apparently satisfied by building a Sunday school. The time is therefore past for the establishment of Church primary schools, even if they suited the conditions of the country. The sphere of secondary grammar schools for boys and girls is, however, open and full of hope.

It must be admitted that a system of primary education is being built up which is in many ways most admirable. The outlay for a population of four and three-quarter millions in Australasia is over £2,370,000. This works out at £4 3s. 3d. for every child in average attendance. In 1880

the denominational foundations were finally taken over by the State. It was time ; for they overlapped, were fruitful sources of strife, and were generally unsatisfactory. Since then Government has assumed almost complete charge of education. There are different Education Acts in each of the seven states, since Federal Parliament is not yet concerned with the matter.

On the whole, the prevailing system is ' free, compulsory, and secular ' for all children between six and fourteen years of age. There are local modifications. The Minister of Education may be also responsible for the Bureau of Agriculture. In Tasmania he may be Treasurer as well as Public Instruction Superintendent. In one state fees are charged after a certain age ; in another from all but those certified too poor to pay them.

Results judged by certain tests must be accounted satisfactory. In 1861 less than a quarter of those who were married could sign their names. Ten years ago only one per cent. were unable. The general standard of intelligence and breadth of horizon in the people compares most favourably with the Old World. This is due doubtless to a variety of causes. There is a high level of comfort, a large share of leisure, much facility for self-culture. The very quietude of country districts, where books and magazines are available, ministers to development. Paucity of local news in a thin population breeds an interest in larger problems and European movements. An Australian artisan who daily reads his metropolitan paper—with its page of European cablegrams—is in a much better position to judge of questions of the greater world than the average Englishman. Thus it follows that children of the primary schools will write you admirable essays on ' The Future of Australia,' or ' The Value of Universal Military Training.' They are none of them over fourteen, but hundreds of competitors will shew that they have learnt to look beyond their immediate horizon and have been encouraged to read.

The method of teaching is scarcely behind the most modern uses. Mental arithmetic and writing are possibly not taught better than elsewhere. Playful, and passing



experiments in giving smatterings of dead and foreign languages will not stand a long test ; nor was the community long satisfied with the moral lessons in which the name of the Deity might not occur. Kindergarten methods are now freely used. More attention is being paid to illustrations of lessons by concrete examples in drawing, writing, and spelling. And, happily, reading books have at last been issued which deal with plants, birds, animals, and common natural objects of Australia. The power of observation has been singularly neglected in the past, so that the ordinary ' township ' child would no more distinguish a ' blackwood ' from a eucalyptus than an honey-sucker from a lyre bird. More than twelve per cent. of the population are in constant attendance at State schools—which are remarkable nurseries of imperial patriotism. No need here to insist on the keeping of Empire Day. And no need to encourage attendance of parents and friends on ' Visiting Day.' The local member of Parliament takes care to be there, and the work of the year is exhibited on the walls. The well-drilled, uniformed cadet-corps, with its miniature rifles, is a useful starting-point for the new regulations of universal service. The annual institution of ' Arbor Day,' with the planting of the suburban streets, or the up-country township, with planes and sugar gums, gives a practical lesson in taming the wild, which is the main objective of Australians.

State school teachers are considerable personages up-country. Much of the work of an English country clergyman comes within their scope, for they are usually the best-educated men of the district and frequently also lay-readers or local preachers. Men may easily rise to political eminence by this channel, as witness the Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives.

In a city school of 800 children the head master's pay may amount to £400 a year with a house. He has allowances for fuel and lighting, the chance of earning something by private tuition, which is forbidden but winked at. And he may rise to be an inspector at £600 a year. Under-teachers are by comparison insufficiently paid and over-worked. The huge classes of 80 to 130 children cause

constant breakdowns from overstrain of throat or nerves in this exacting climate; and political influences sometimes interfere with sinister bearing on the teachers' prospects.

Over the vast continent the net is widespread and close-meshed. In the cities busy attendance-inspectors are quick to summon careless parents. In the 'back-blocks' small provisional schools serve wide districts to which children may be perhaps carried fifteen miles morning and evening on the railway. And still the difficulty of distances or the laxness of parents makes it possible for five per cent. of the population to escape all provision for education. In New South Wales 17,000, in Victoria 13,000, in Queensland 3300, in South Australia 8200, in New Zealand 13,000, in Tasmania 2400 children are returned as not receiving any instruction either at home or at school. Fifty thousand children who are growing up presumably in utter ignorance is a formidable proportion. But, on the whole, it is surprising that the escape is so small.

## II.

Of secondary education it is not possible to give such a uniform account. It is chiefly in the hands of religious bodies or corporations, though a parallel system of State-aided secondary or 'continuation' schools is being pressed. In Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney, the schools which answer to English public schools are financed and managed by Anglicans, Romans, Wesleyans, Presbyterians. Such are St. Peter's, Adelaide, Melbourne Grammar School, Geelong, Paramatta. Sydney Grammar School has old endowments but no connexion with the Church. Until the arrival of Archbishop Lowther Clarke in Victoria the Roman Catholic convent schools had been the best secondary provision for girls, and were much used by Anglicans. The Wesleyans came next in enterprise at Adelaide, at Melbourne—where Dr. Fitchett is President of the Girls' High School—and elsewhere. Within the last five years the Archbishop of Melbourne and the Bishop of Ballarat have introduced great constructive energy, so that grammar schools for both boys

and girls have sprung up and flourished amazingly. It only needed a strong and experienced leader to shew that, though the State had captured the primary position, there remained the equally important sphere of secondary education for the Church, and Anglicans rallied at once. Government has not shewn itself antagonistic—for, indeed, the financial strain of their elementary system has been as much as the country could bear. The Advanced School for girls in South Australia has its expenses guaranteed by the State, numbers 130 pupils, and receives some fifty bursary scholars from primary schools. The same principle, with modifications according to conditions, is followed for the boys. New South Wales spends £6500 in sending 105 bursary boys from State schools to Sydney Grammar School, High schools, or the University. Victoria gives one hundred exhibitions of £10 to promising pupils in the same way. There is no small competition in the grammar schools to get these approved pupils, who, like Professor Henderson of Adelaide University, may rise to eminence. Queensland has spent over £280,000 in the endowment and upkeep of schools.

Thus a ladder has been built, up which, irrespective of birth, religion, or parentage, a clever boy can climb—without any cost to his parents—from village school in the back-blocks to a Fellowship at All Souls, the Rhodes' Endowment helping. This is possible, no doubt, in England by reason of the varied foundations for scholarships, many of them of ancient standing. But it is no small thing for a new country to have accomplished in thirty years.

Standards of teaching, it need scarcely be said, are at this stage ludicrously behind European. Classical study is terribly at a discount. Mathematics are probably almost up-to-date, and science taught as well as in most English public schools which have not a very special modern side. History of every kind has always been lamentably neglected—scarcely anything being taught of Roman, Greek, French, or German history, and very little of English. The attempts to grapple with modern languages are likely to achieve better success in the future. It would be surprising to learn that ten Australian-taught boys could write a set of Iambics



or scan a verse of Homer. The classical attainments of a sixth-form boy at almost any school would disgrace a lower-fifth boy at Rugby. His athletics, however, would be quite up to the mark. It is not uncommon for a boy from Geelong or St. Peter's, Adelaide, to pass direct into the Oxford or Cambridge Eight. And in general information, in acquaintance with up-to-date industrial or commercial problems, he would shew marked superiority. Ask for an essay on 'Coloured Immigration,' 'Expansion of the Japanese Race,' 'The Trans-Continental Railway,' and he will have very decided opinions backed by strong argument. Conversation with his parents—thanks to absence of the boarding-house system—has kept him in touch with affairs which interest the nation. He does not limit himself in debating society and club to forensic matters. He is older, more thoughtful, more in touch with the world than your English boy of the same age.

There are some 130,000 boys and girls in various types of secondary school and a total teaching staff of over 9000. Many of them—schools and teachers alike—are scarcely qualified for their work. Within the last few years stringent measures have been taken in Victoria to enforce 'registration,' which guarantees some measure of capacity.

The head masters of the best schools have usually had an English University education or have been directly imported from home. The junior masters are less frequently graduates, the difficulty being to guarantee a living wage and any 'prospects.' There is little future for the man who, coming out from England at twenty-five, can easily secure £220 and free board. If there is a boarding-house the head master takes, as a rule, all the profits. Fifteen guineas a year is the average amount of fees, so that without the endowments—which in Sydney and Adelaide are considerable—or State aid, the better colleges could not be carried on. The pay of the head master may be £1500 or £2000, while few of his assistants receive more than £400. The inexpensiveness of the total fees and the prevalence of the day-boy system, in a community where wealth is more evenly divided than in England, makes for democratic equality. The son

of the wealthy squatter, who will presently proceed to Trinity, Cambridge, is for years in the same class with the son of a village publican and the State School bursars. Any social division there is runs latitudinally according to creed, not vertically according to descent. The great athletic contests in Adelaide or Melbourne are between St. Peter's and Prince Alfred's—the Anglicans and Wesleyans—or between the Roman Christian Brothers and the Presbyterian College. The five hundred mile distance between the capitals of course prevents schools of the same colour meeting so often as they would wish—yet in rowing the great Anglican schools from three capitals have an annual contest.

It is claimed, probably with truth, that in spite of everything as strong a spirit of *esprit de corps* is developed here as in any great public schools; and English head masters admit that Australian boys can be more implicitly trusted not to break 'bounds' or other rules of discipline than English boys. If this be so, it says much for the far less constant oversight and watching which of necessity prevails.

There are those who maintain that one thing most to be desired for Australia is a central public school—preferably in a cool climate—to which future leaders of the Commonwealth could be sent when young, that they might be educated together. An Eton or Winchester, with its traditions and privileges, will be long to seek in a democratic country which advances so slowly in population.

Something may be said of the school chapels which here, perhaps more than at home, form a strong connecting link between succeeding generations of boys, and also between school and parent. In St. Peter's, Adelaide, the music of the Service is little behind that of an Oxford college, and on Sundays the Chapel almost does duty as a parochial church. This is also true of the Grammar School, Melbourne. Attendance at daily prayers in Chapel is in every case compulsory, objections being rarely raised by the parents of Nonconformist children. In the smaller grammar schools there is usually a close connexion between the parish choir and the school, free scholarships being liberally arranged for by

congregations. The daily attendance at shortened Mattins as the beginning of work ensures some knowledge of the Prayer Book, making it likely that in time to come these boys will be satisfied with no other form of Service.

### III.

The most striking variation from European Universities is the necessary prominence given to technical instruction. New South Wales spends £34,000 on its technical college, almost as much as on the University proper; the other states in the same proportion on schools of mines, of design, agricultural colleges, mechanical engineering shops. A member of Parliament in Victoria has endowed a working man's college with £15,500 and it is used by all classes of the community. There are besides eighteen other technical schools, for a population of a million, dividing between them £22,000 of public money and receiving £10,000 in annual fees. These colleges are attended very largely at night by teachers and apprentices. They cater for a great diversity of needs—shorthand, bookbinding, metallurgy, practical dynamics, and anything that ministers to the development of mineral and agricultural resources.

The connexion of the Universities with Government gives them enormous influence in setting the standard of all public examinations. The plan of Oxford and Cambridge Junior and Senior Local Examinations has been followed, but here a much larger proportion of students are bound to enter for them. State school teachers who wish to take a degree, boys who wish to pass into the Civil Service, the hospitals, or lawyers' offices, must exhibit a diploma from the Junior or Senior. It is often the sole academic qualification of ordination candidates. The system is being certainly overdone and there is a strong revolt against it. Shallowness of education is the outstanding blemish, and is being made worse by superficial cramming. But professors imported from the centres of learning may be excused if they shew special ardour in attempting to raise the general tone in whatever



way they can. They are, on the whole, well paid, receiving in the major posts £800 per annum, which they supplement by writing for the Press and giving Extension Lectures.

The whole University system is in truth much more like a glorified scheme of Extension lecturing than anything else. As in the case of secondary schools it depends, financially, upon endowments, State aid, and fees. Sydney University, founded in 1852, was followed by Melbourne in 1855, by South Australia in 1874, and by Tasmania in 1890. Sydney, with 730 students, has an income of £40,000, of which £12,000 is Government grant, £12,000 from lecture fees, and £16,000 from other sources of endowment. At the five Universities of the principal states there are 2800 students. At Sydney there are three undenominational colleges for men and a fourth for women. In Melbourne there are three affiliated denominational colleges—Anglican, Presbyterian, and Wesleyan. The Roman Catholics were offered the same chance of a free site as other bodies, but refused to accept any public aid. In one of these colleges is a hall for the accommodation of women. The magnificent buildings of Ormond College (Presbyterian) are a token of what this wealthy and generous communion has been willing to do for education and religion. Trinity College (Anglican) is filled to overflowing, the Chapel Services are particularly part of the discipline, but there is not sufficient money at present to enlarge the buildings. Adelaide and Hobart have no affiliated colleges, while in New Zealand the Universities are examining more than teaching bodies. Students—male and female—keep their terms mainly at Christchurch, Dunedin, and Otago Colleges.

These Universities give degrees, B.A., M.A., B.Sc., teaching the ordinary subjects, but with the notable exception of theology. A strong attempt was made five years ago by the Archbishop of Melbourne, who is *ex officio* on the Council of his University, to introduce a Theological Faculty. He was supported by leaders of the Presbyterian body, but the Chief Justice, as Chancellor, interposed by declaring that such an introduction was contrary to the Statutes and would need to be sanctioned by an Act of Parliament.

Efforts to secure this still continue, but have failed of success at present.

The medical schools, and they are very full, are probably as good as anywhere in the world. There is not, of course, the hospital experience which can be had in London or Vienna ; but the medical profession is extremely well paid and spares no pains in introducing the latest inventions of its art. Philosophy and psychology schools are not inadequate. The classical side, if small, is well taught up to a very limited standard. Some prominence has been given to the teaching of political economy and political philosophy, but none to any proper teaching of history. Experimental science and applied mathematics naturally are high in public favour. Attempts are continually being made to abolish Greek as a necessary subject for the Arts degree. They were successful in New Zealand, but driven out of the field at Adelaide and Melbourne chiefly by the influence of Professors Tucker and Bensley. It says much for the loyalty of lawyers, merchants, and graduates of standing that they were willing to oppose this innovation. The battle will almost certainly have to be fought again when democratic governments succeed in getting entire control and insist on all elementary State teachers passing two years at a University.

Only a small proportion of undergraduates live in college. When, as in Adelaide, there are none, the special *ethos* of English University life is much to seek. The usual athletic and social clubs go some way towards bridging the gap, but they have not the numerical strength one would expect. It is to be remembered that boys often begin work in the University at seventeen, maintaining themselves as pupil-teachers while they take a two years' course for Bachelor of Laws or of Science. The Rhodes scholar will, according to the présent unfortunate plan, have usually spent three years at college before he leaves for Oxford at the late age of twenty-two. He will then be too old to mix on equal terms with the comparatively unsophisticated freshman of eighteen.

There is, of course, nothing answering to the University sermon at St. Mary's or the institution of Proctor. The Universities' Christian Student Movement. has, however,

exercised a marked and beneficent influence during the last ten or twelve years, and is increasing in power. In respect of 'Encaenia' Australian undergraduates, who were encouraged at first by the authorities, have developed regrettable licence. It is not unknown for their musical contributions on Degree Day to drown entirely the speech of the Chancellor, or for the representative of the Crown to insist on an apology for horseplay. Public opinion, though very much in favour of letting the young man have his fling, has decided that the limit of boisterous juvenility has now been reached. But Universities are not in Australia designed as schools of manners or morals. Their purpose is to give definite instruction as a means of getting on in life.

ARTHUR G. B. WEST.

#### ART. IV.—THE MODERN CONCEPTION OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

1. *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*. Von ALBERT SCHWEITZER. (Tübingen : J. C. B. Mohr. 1906.)
2. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus : a Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. By ALBERT SCHWEITZER, Privatdozent in New Testament Studies in the University of Strassburg. Translated by W. MONTGOMERY, B.A., B.D. With a Preface by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London : A. and C. Black. 1910.)
3. *Essays on some Biblical Questions of the Day*. By Members of the University of Cambridge. Edited by H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity. No. 7. *The Eschatological Idea in the Gospel*. By F. C. BURKITT, M.A., D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity. (London : Macmillan and Co. 1909.)
4. *Christianity at the Cross-roads*. By G. TYRRELL. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co. 1910.)

And other Works.



AN article recently published in this Review<sup>1</sup> dealt with the history of the eschatological idea in its relation to the scriptural conception of the kingdom of Heaven.

'The Kingdom of Heaven,' says the writer, 'is a phrase with which all are conversant from the reading of our Lord's teaching in the Gospels; but it may provide an interesting study when regarded, as here, historically, in its relation to the whole eschatological furniture of the Jewish people, of which it forms one of the chief factors.'

The object of the present article is somewhat different, its purpose being to consider the relation between the ideas legitimately implied in the phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven,' and current conceptions of man's place in the universe.

Of course it would not be legitimate to sever the present from the past, to suggest that the phrase has a meaning for us which it had not in the preceding ages, and yet if we are prepared to admit the dynamic character of Christian revelation, it will be only natural to expect that as the ages pass by this concept will appear to have a constantly increasing content. But the fuller content, which perhaps we may discover in the idea of which the phrase is the symbol, can only be legitimate if it be the product of growth; an acorn cannot develop into a fig-tree; it is by its fruits that the seed as well as the tree is known to us.

## I.

There is much that is helpful in the familiar presentation of our Lord as performing the threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King, a notion which is itself older than Christianity, and was applied in eschatological literature to the person of the Messiah. Viewed in the fuller light of Christian experience we are able to perceive our Lord as Prophet, using the word in its truest and best sense, declaring to us three things: (1) the nature of God; (2) the nature of

<sup>1</sup> 'Eschatology and the Kingdom of Heaven' (*C.Q.R.*, October 1909).

man ; (3) the ideal relation which should subsist between man and God. This ideal relation must in one sense be considered as a potentiality, yet a potentiality must necessarily pre-suppose an actuality, and, as we believe, the Incarnation itself prepared the way, or is the necessary postulate, of this potentially ideal relation between man and God, the potentiality which really has been actualized by the individual who gives himself to Christ. By the Incarnation, of course, is meant not only the nativity of Christ, but all that is implied in His birth, His life, His sufferings and His death, His resurrection and ascension. It would, therefore, be seen that in this is necessarily included the idea of the Atonement or reconciliation of man to God, *i.e.* the breaking down of the barrier which man had erected between himself and his Maker ; and this was consummated by the one oblation of Himself once offered, made on the Altar of the Cross by Christ Himself. It is in this that we may see the work of our Lord as Priest. The superscription written over the Cross described our Lord as King, and Christian piety has loved to speak of Him as reigning from the Tree, the type of human suffering and degradation being transfigured so as to become the symbol of that beneficent and superhuman monarchy which finds its expression in the Kingdom of Heaven or the Kingdom of God.

‘It is finished,’ were the words which He uttered in the consciousness of the perfection of the work of human redemption. Let us add to them words which are at the very heart of the concept of the new order thus inaugurated, ‘Lo ! I make all things new’ ; henceforth we may well think of our Lord as reigning in a Kingdom to which it is impossible justly to apply any other designation than the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven. It is the implication of this idea, especially in relation to modern thought, that is at present under consideration.

These relations should be described as potential, being based on the actual happenings which we include in the comprehensive term of the Incarnation, but their potentiality is manward rather than Godward, for their actualization

necessarily depends upon the action of the human will, or rather, to speak more accurately, on the action of the individual personality in its entirety in its effort to apprehend and assimilate the message of the Gospel. That message, in the course of the years immediately subsequent to the Crucifixion, proved to some a stumbling-block, to others foolishness ; it is so to this day, and we may reasonably ask ourselves why this is the case. Surely the first and most obvious answer to the question is that it consists primarily in a 'transvaluation of values,' and it may be well to consider this notion at the outset.

## II.

We owe the phrase 'transvaluation of values' to the modern German school of Biblical criticism, which, however unsatisfactory it may appear to be in its method of dealing with the Gospel narrative, at least has earned our gratitude by the emphasis that it has laid upon the human element in our Lord's activity, though by some it will be felt that it has failed to bring out with clearness, or even fairness, the other side of the Gospel message.

It will scarcely be denied that the idea of the transvaluation of values stands in the forefront of our Lord's teaching, and especially with respect to those to whom the Kingdom is promised. It is the poor, and those that mourn, the meek, the hungry, and the thirsty, and those who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, who are especially promised the inheritance of the Kingdom. Or we may take another aspect of our Lord's teaching, that which is contained in the eighth chapter of St. Mark, where, after His prediction of His own sufferings and His recognition by Simon Peter as the Messiah at Caesarea Philippi, He tells His hearers that whosoever would come after Him must deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Him : he that is to save his life shall lose it, but he that shall lose his life for the sake of the Master and His Gospel shall save it. Surely it is impossible to deny that at the very heart of the teaching of our Lord this notion is to be found,



when we hear Him thus emphatically demanding of those who would be His disciples that they should assume as the badge of their discipleship the symbol of extreme suffering and human degradation.

And if we pass from our Lord's teaching, many examples of which will suggest themselves in this connexion, to His life, we shall find that the actual message of the Gospel, that is to say, the good news of the life and redemptive death of Jesus the Messiah as preached by the Apostles to Jew and Gentile, must have carried with it in even more emphatic tones than any which our Lord had used Himself, the idea at present under consideration. It is not surprising that to those whose upbringing had been under the old dispensation these notions should have appeared to be of the nature of a stumbling-block. It was hard for such people, holding the traditions of their forefathers, to interpret in the light of the events of the Gospel history the notion of the transcendent Deity of the Old Testament, or the Messianic hopes it contained. Nor could it be easier for those who had been trained in the aesthetic and intellectual environment of Athens or Alexandria. To the first it was a stumbling-block, to the second it was foolishness. But St. Paul tells us that to those who are being called, Christ was the power of God and the wisdom of God.

It is noticeable that the Apostle in his writings seldom refers to any event in our Lord's life except to its consummation on the Cross, or to any specific saying which may be attributed to Him. St. Paul seems to appeal to our Lord as He is, rather than as He spoke or acted. It is in this manner, for example, that he deals with the particular difficulties of the Colossian Christians. Believing as they did in the Gnostic hierarchy of spiritual beings, powers, principalities, thrones, dominions, etc., and its supposed function of mediating between God and man, they were also tainted with that false conception which so often reappears in subsequent history—the conception of matter as in itself evil. The Apostle met these difficulties by calling their attention to the Person of Christ. In Him, he tells them, the totality of the Divine nature and attributes

dwelt in bodily fashion in accordance with the good pleasure of the Father. And by this very statement he is able to offer an answer to both their difficulties. It is, on the one hand, an eternal protest which he utters against the unhappy conception of the evil nature of matter ; on the other hand, whether there be such powers, principalities, dominions, and the like, became henceforward almost a matter of indifference. There is one Mediator between God and man, even Christ, in Whose Person both natures are united.

### III.

It will necessarily follow from this that at the very outset the teaching of the Church concerning the nature of the Kingdom dealt with the problem which at all times has perplexed human thought, namely, the relation of spirit and matter. And this question has of necessity always taken a prominent position in Christian teaching, in so far as that teaching deserved the epithet of Christian by being representative and complete. It is not, of course, suggested that the problem was approached in a purely speculative manner, or that arguments of a purely rationalistic character were used for and against it by the first teachers of Christianity. But it is true to say that for Christian thought the solution of this and kindred difficulties has been found only in the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation. Further, it is fair to say that the relation between the material and the spiritual which Christianity has always taught, is largely independent of the various types of metaphysical theories.

It may well be doubted whether any of the recognized metaphysical theories is necessarily excluded from the Christian doctrine on this point. But there can be no doubt that Christianity does exclude the view of matter as essentially evil. Against this view (as St. Paul teaches) the real humanity of our Lord is the necessary and eternal protest. Many would hold that the extension of this idea is to be found in the notion of a visible Church and in the sacramental system, especially with regard to those sacraments which were instituted by our Lord Himself, and

most particularly perhaps in the Eucharist, His parting gift to the Church.

The consideration of this notion should serve to demonstrate that the material world has a place in the Kingdom, that matter, according to the Apostolic conception (which has merely developed the implications of our Lord's teaching, life, and death), is used by God as the means or channel of spiritual activity. This view is by no means inconsistent with modern thought. It is at least opposed to that view of the universe which has been described as 'cutting the world in two with a hatchet.' It is essentially a unifying concept, and as such will to some extent be welcomed by all synthetic thinkers. It is rather on the surface that the paradox of the Kingdom is most apparent. When we penetrate further we become conscious of the deeper realities which the conception of it implies. True, it must appear, it has appeared and does still appear, to many as 'foolishness,' but sooner or later the 'foolishness of God' is recognized as wiser than the wisdom of man; and we cannot fail to remark that the wisdom of man as it advances is apt to find a striking confirmation of its own supposed discoveries in the revelation of the 'foolishness of God' which has always been latent in the idea of the Kingdom. The recognition of this truth enables us to carry the idea of the transvaluation of values a little further.

It is from the Tree, as we have seen, that our Lord reigns. It is the despised and rejected of men, the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, the crucified criminal, rejected of His own nation, deserted by His own chosen followers, Who by means of those who recognized the divine power manifested in His Resurrection, is to offer to mankind a new heaven and a new earth, a new object of faith, a new direction of hope, a new bond of love. Since then of all that the world held to be desirable our Lord offered nothing to His followers, seeing that nearly all that was in their eyes estimable and valuable appeared to have no part in the Kingdom, it is necessary to consider what it was that was offered in their place.



## IV.

Reference was made above to the triad of virtues on which St. Paul is ever insisting: faith, hope, and love. It was these that our Lord offered to His followers and demanded from them in turn. The first essential was faith. It was no small, visible world which could satisfy those who were to enter the Kingdom. The things which are seen are temporal, the things which are unseen are eternal, and faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the testing of things not seen. The spiritual life of the disciple must be on a large and transcendent scale. He might not have a universe which, like that of Laplace, had no room for God, nor yet might he have the concept of 'otherworldliness' which practically left no room for man. He must love his brother whom he had seen, and God Whom no man hath ever seen. And though his own relations both to God and to his neighbour were far from what he could wish, and though the relations of his neighbours to each other and of all to God were even less desirable than his own, yet by hope he must see the goal to which the world is tending. Faith had enabled him to grasp the idea of a new heaven and a new earth, of the coming of a divine kingdom; hope was needed to strengthen and encourage him in his effort to co-operate with God in hastening its spread.

Finally there was love, love of God and love of man, more precious than the gifts of tongues and of prophecy and the knowledge of mysteries, the very bond of peace and of all virtues. And of these three, though the greatest of them be love, it is written that they all abide. They possess, that is, an element of permanence, stability, and ultimacy which cannot be claimed for anything which is material. The mountain has not always been a mountain and will not always remain one, but love has always been love. And all these three had been manifest in the Person of the divine Head of the Kingdom, and along with them in particular had been manifest one especial aspect of love, namely sacrifice. They had been manifested in His Person,

and we may add had been manifested at a higher degree of potentiality, and in a more wonderful relation of proportion and harmony than man had ever conceived before. And they were demanded of all who would be His disciples.

The same idea may be expressed in a different way. What had been offered to man and what was demanded from man was reality. Reality had been manifested in the Person of our Lord, reality was demanded from the lives of His followers. The Kingdom must be a real Kingdom, of which all other kingdoms are and will be the types and shadows. 'I came not to destroy but to fulfil.' In so far as there was any reality in the whole idea of a Kingdom that reality was fulfilled in the Kingdom which our Lord founded ; but so different was it from the current notions, so different is it from our modern views, that it can scarcely be surprising that it will appear as foolishness to many who are asked to recognize it as it is. 'Silver and gold have I none ; but such as I have give I thee.' These words are put into the mouth of one who was among the very first adherents of the new order. And that which they had was a power far transcending that which was or is possessed by any earthly potentate. And the emphatic point is that it was more real.

## V.

Reality is a dangerous matter to speak of, especially in an age when the teaching of natural science, having penetrated to the less educated, has tended to produce an altogether false notion on this subject. Unfortunately for us to-day it is the material world which is by the uneducated regarded as of the essence of reality: it is the stone, and the chair, and the table which are regarded by these as things which are real in themselves. Of course this is not the case among those who have enjoyed even the rudiments of a philosophical education, and yet we must remember that the Kingdom is for all alike, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, and for all it is the eternal protest against this notion.

It is easy for us to see that natural science does not pretend to offer any solution of the problems which rightly belong to philosophy: it is easy to quote the words of eminent scientists to the effect that natural science is merely descriptive, and not interpretative, that it is, as has been said, descriptive shorthand, that it has nothing to do with the relation of cause and effect, that it is not concerned with any criterion of reality. All this is familiar enough to some of us, but it is not equally familiar to our less educated brethren. They are unable to distinguish between the notions of description and explanation: they imagine that if they can describe some of the processes through which material bodies have passed, they are thereby able to offer an explanation of their genesis and even of their purpose. Philosophy, on the other hand, can, and does, legitimately deal with such subjects. How little of a definite character it has to say on these matters is well known to many of us. But the teaching of our Lord and His followers with regard to the Kingdom is definite enough. There is no denial of that which is seen, there is the strongest affirmation of that which is unseen. There is the clear assertion of the relation between the seen and the unseen, a clear linking together of the material and the spiritual, not as two disparate substances which it is hard to conceive as being legitimately brought together, but as part of one whole, having for its Creator God the Father Almighty, Who 'saw all things which He had made and behold they were very good,' and Who sent His only begotten Son, by Whom He had created the worlds, to make all things new in the redemption of the world by the power of His Cross.

For, be it observed, when we examine the nature of the Kingdom, it has two aspects, namely, an aspect of monarchy and an aspect of brotherhood. All that is true, all that is inspiring, all that is necessary in that transcendent conception of God with which we are familiar in the Old Testament is taken over and is interpreted, but stress is laid also on the notion of divine immanence in the world. Yet it is a monarchy and not a republic. It seems very



difficult to reconcile the Christian conception of the Kingdom with the modern schools of pluralistic philosophy. For, as it has been said, the pluralist when he prays 'Thy Kingdom come,' is thinking of the advent of a kind of spiritual commonwealth, we on the other hand rather of the time when God shall be all in all.

'Thy Kingdom come.' The words are familiar, but we may well pause for a few moments and try to consider what is implied in them. Surely it is neither more nor less than a prayer for the realization of this notion of the transvaluation of values, and for the acceptance of the revelation of the Fatherhood of God, not as it was conceived in pre-Christian times, but as it has been revealed in the Person of our Lord Himself; and further, the notion of the brotherhood of man.

But the brotherhood of man may be conceived in various ways, and the New Testament conception of it is that which particularly concerns us here, for the brotherhood of man is only to be realized by entry into the Kingdom. We may well admit that it is potential outside the Kingdom; it is actualized, however, within the Kingdom. It is the Spirit which is sent forth into each individual heart which cries: 'Abba, Father.' One by one they are, have been, and shall be gathered into the Kingdom, and the Spirit which has taught them to cry 'Abba, Father' is a Spirit of adoption. It is by adoption that they become the sons of God and heirs of the Kingdom, and this sonship and heirship which they individually enjoy constitute a link of brotherhood between the individuals.

And the entry into the Kingdom can be effected in one way only. Consciously or unconsciously, it must be by means of our Lord Himself. 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' It is by means of Him that we enter, it is by means of the revelation constituted in His Person that we perceive the answer to Pilate's question: 'What is truth?' It is by means of our vital contact with Him that life flows from His Divine Person into us. Here and here alone is contact with reality. Here and here alone is a means of filling the comparative emptiness of our own individual

existence, for the method of the Incarnation appears to be essentially a method of filling that which is relatively empty, a taking up of the lower into the higher.

Now, this idea is familiar to us by actual experience. All material objects may be described as being comparatively empty, but capable of being filled by us with a higher form of reality which they cannot and do not in themselves possess. We are constantly doing it. We take some material object and bring it into touch with some higher form of reality, and lo, it is transfigured before our eyes and shines with a new light. All art is the vindication of this principle. This is the method of the sculptor with the stone, of the painter with his canvas and pigments, and it is essentially the method of the Incarnation. It is the fulfilment of types and shadows, the ratification of all that is legitimate and true in however small a measure in human life and experience, the condemnation and obliteration of all that obscures even that measure of reality which we may claim for ourselves and our experience.

## VI.

In considering the prophetic function of our Lord, and the revelation of God which was made in His Person, it is impossible to ignore the revelation of man which comes to us through and by Him. And here we are face to face with an aspect of the Kingdom which is certainly very foreign to some tendencies of modern thought, and it is therefore useful to contrast the idea of man as a subject for the Kingdom such as we find in the New Testament, with the idea, for example, of the *Über-Mensch* of Nietzsche, familiar in some kind of development to us in the notion of the Super-Man.

It is true to say that through the Christian conception we see man at his highest potential development in the image of the suffering Christ which is presented to us by the Crucifix. The message of this symbol of our redemption appears to be something to this effect: this is, or ought to be, your ideal, not Plato, not Aristotle, not Alexander, not Napoleon,

not Dante, not Michael Angelo ; none of these separately nor all of these together represents man at his highest development. This you may find here, and here alone, in the Figure with outstretched hands nailed to the symbol of shame and suffering. It is in proportion as you approximate to this, as you exemplify in your own person the spirit of sonship and obedience, the spirit of perception of higher realities and of scorn and distrust of all which— attractive as it may be in itself—in truth separates man from that which is reality or God, in proportion as you accomplish all this in your person you are more truly, more really, a man.

This is the exact antithesis of the notion which underlies the teaching of Nietzsche and of some of his English followers, and the reason is perfectly simple. It is a question of the centre of gravity of the conception. In one case this is to be found in the spiritual, in the other in the material. In this connexion we may consider also the materialistic teaching which is current among ourselves, and is so profusely represented in popular literature. Here again the emphasis is on the material side. Attention is so concentrated on the material organism by which, as we think, the spiritual is mediated, that the very nature of the spiritual is left out of sight altogether. Hence, as we should suppose, an absolute divergence of ideals is represented. For this reason Nietzsche condemns what he calls the slave-morality of Christianity, for this reason the very idea of the brotherhood of man is to him especially repugnant, and hence it is that we have presented to us a new Gospel : a new commandment give I unto you, ' Be hard.' Love is no longer the co-ordinating force, as it is presented in the Christian revelation.

Other schools of thought, although they are prepared to lay a far greater stress on the brotherhood of man, yet set up an ideal which is altogether contrary to that of the Cross. It is partly due to the fact that in their dealings with the world they have refused to follow the advice of the great statesman and to use large maps. Their horizon is so bounded by the visible and the tangible that they are



unduly impressed, though perhaps generously affected, by the sight of suffering and sorrow, which they conceive rather as an end than as a means. It is not likely that any panacea offered by them will obtain more than a very passing recognition by those who are ready to face the problem as it really is. It is improbable that for most of us the Super-Man is a very attractive conception, or that many will find a really helpful incentive to virtue in the hope that their striving and self-denial will in some way affect the well-being of successive generations who will occupy their place when they have ceased to exist, and for whom it is difficult to demonstrate that they really have any responsibility whatever.

'Why should the Super-Man be evolved?' is a question which it is not unreasonable to ask. A disciple of this school of thought was recently heard to state that though he was not prepared to affirm at the moment the existence of a God, he was sure that if God did not at present exist He would come into being at some future time.

A statement of this kind is certainly startling, yet it was made by one who had read and thought and suffered. It is surely true now, as in the days of St. Paul, that 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now,' and 'the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God.' And the answer to the expectation is the same now as then. It is contained in the words of our Lord Himself, which are probably most safely rendered, 'the Kingdom of Heaven is amongst you.' There is no necessity to await the advent of the Super-Man, evolved as the product of the sufferings and strivings of an almost purposeless humanity. Our acceptance of the Son of Man interpreting as He does for us both the possibilities and in some sense the very purpose of humanity, renders us altogether independent of such an idea. True, the acceptance of the ideal is gradual, but it has been well said that Christianity is a very new religion, and the very concept of the Kingdom is bound up with the notion of its gradual spread. It is the leaven hidden in three measures of meal, and, like all that is normal and

healthy and permanent, its growth under the conditions in which we are existent is and must be orderly and gradual.

Yet our hope is a fair one. 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me.' And so we pray daily for the advent of the Kingdom which is already come, for the spread of the Kingdom into which, as we hope, the fulness of mankind will ultimately be gathered. And as each individual or each community or nation is gathered in it will add something to our knowledge of the new relations implied in the Kingdom. As the particular gifts which the individual or the community possesses are consecrated to the spread of the Kingdom, as the particular vices which the individual or community possesses are gradually extirpated by the humanizing influence of the divine grace conveyed therein, we shall see more and more clearly the manner of God's dealings with men. For each one as he enters must lose his soul in order to find it, must be born of water and of the spirit, must become as a little child.

This will be neither easier nor more difficult nowadays than it was for Nicodemus in the days of the Gospel, excepting that in an age which is so essentially materialistic as ours undeniably is, the spiritual character of the Kingdom is perhaps harder of acceptance than before. And it is easy to suppose that many who are in themselves by no means materialistic have increased this difficulty for themselves and others by that separation between the material and the spiritual which finds its expression in the rejection of the sacramental teaching of the Church. The water of baptism, the bread and wine of the Eucharist, have been to some a stumbling-block and to others foolishness, neither more nor less than the very notion of the Kingdom itself has been.

## VII.

The redemption of the body and the sanctification of the material may lead naturally to the consideration of two other points in connexion with the Kingdom. First, its relation to time ; secondly, its relation to space. Here it is

not necessary to enter upon any discussion of vexed questions of metaphysics ; but whatever our views may be, we are bound to admit that all human development implies an attempt to rise superior to the limitations of time and space. It is the here and the now by which we are always being checked and thwarted. We love, in our historical researches, to make the past our own, we grope dimly enough in the darkness of the future for some guiding star which will help us to interpret both past and present. And yet, as we believe, there is neither past nor future with God, but to Him all things are present. To Him in like manner there is neither here nor there, and we in our struggle to overcome our local and temporal restrictions find a kind of rest in the contemplation of Him for Whom these restrictions have no meaning.

There is a sense and a very real sense in which the Kingdom may be said to transcend both these limitations. Surely it is true to say of it that it is both here and now, but no less of other spheres and other ages, that those who may claim membership in the Kingdom may claim kindred and affinity with past and future members in a sense that no other society can claim, that we are one with those who have preceded us and with those who are to come after us in a very real and even practical sense. For even the materialistic conceptions of the present age have not succeeded in robbing the notion of the communion of saints of all meaning.

There is one Mediator between God and man, and He is the Divine Ruler of the Kingdom ; there is one link, that is to say, between the timeless, the eternal, the unconditioned, and the world of time and of space in which we move and in a limited sense have our being. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. For us men and for our salvation He condescended to submit Himself to the law of becoming, but only to reveal to us the actual nature of His being, and the Kingdom which He founded and in which we claim membership, although it is true that we see it growing before our eyes, that it is known to us perhaps in the only way that anything can be known to



us, namely in the form of becoming, yet reveals to us, if we have the eyes to see, an element of being which is only partially hidden beneath the veil of becoming. For the Kingdom of necessity cuts right across the world of our immediate experience, being a link between the visible and the invisible. It transcends the very distinction between life and death, for it is inconceivable that those who have been of the Kingdom here on earth will cease to be members of it when their pilgrimage is over. Rather, as the Christian consciousness has always inclined to believe, they will enter more fully into the inheritance which has been purchased for them. And in this connexion we may use a familiar figure, that has lost none of its truth and significance, though in this present age it is essentially unpopular: it is the figure of this life as a period of exile from the heavenly home whither, as the Christian hopes, he is to return; the notion, as St. Paul puts it, of being 'present in the body, but absent from the Lord.'

This notion, which is particularly familiar to us through many mediaeval hymns still in constant use, is by no means of late development. The New Testament itself is permeated with the idea, and the superscription of the first Epistle attributed to St. Peter is an apt example. This Epistle is addressed to the 'elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia,' etc. What is the underlying meaning of these words? The elect or chosen are regarded as fulfilling the type of the Jewish Diaspora. The Jew, if away from his native land, was said to be of the 'Dispersion'; the Christian, elect according to the foreknowledge of God, was said even in his proper or native home to be a member of the Dispersion; for his earthly home was conceived as not being his proper home; he was waiting for the Heavenly Jerusalem. It is a notion of which Christian devotional literature is full:

'Jerusalem, my happy home,  
Name ever dear to me,  
When shall my labours have an end?  
Thy joys when shall I see?'

It has been stigmatized as 'otherworldliness'; it has been

said to aim a blow at the dignity of humanity. There is perhaps a sense in which this is true, but in so far as this can be admitted at all, it seems to be safeguarded by the concept of the Kingdom. There is a dignity of humanity and a dignity of human life, yet surely that dignity will be emphasized just in proportion as we lay stress upon that which is most real in humanity and in human life, and this, as we believe, cannot be done except within the Kingdom. It is just in so far as membership of the Kingdom constitutes a foretaste of the more perfect existence which does or should await us after this life, that it may be said to have fulfilled its purpose. But in so doing it will have set its seal on what is worthy and noble or capable of ennoblement in human life, it will have rejected with scorn and loathing what is unreal, undesirable, incapable of improvement. This is not the spirit of 'otherworldliness,' unless it be so to transfer to a lower form of existence at however great a cost and however severe a struggle something of that higher form of existence whither we are tending.

#### VIII.

There is yet another point in connexion with our concept of the Kingdom that demands attention. We are extremely familiar with the notion of the struggle for existence, of development from a lower to a higher order, in the material world. This, which has been revealed to us to a great extent by the discoveries of natural science, has probably not yet reached us in a right perspective. It has, however, managed to convey to us a conception of the world singularly devoid of rest. We are apt to think of everything as tending to change into something else until the goal is lost sight of in our contemplation of the process. There can be little doubt that the lack of rest which is the characteristic of our age is to some extent due to this misconception which we owe in part to the evolutionary hypothesis. For there is no reason why we cannot for practical purposes at least assume that there is some end to this development. We are surely not obliged to regard it as an infinite series.

But when we come to compare with these notions the teaching about the Kingdom, we are immediately brought face to face with a concept in which there is much that suggests rest, and even to some extent finality. 'There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God.' For the people of God are the inheritors of the Kingdom; the sabbath rest is realized therein.

In the course of our consideration of the nature of the Kingdom we have again and again been brought face to face with something of the nature of a paradox, and here certainly is another, for though a fundamental notion of the Kingdom is undeniably rest, and in some sense finality, equally fundamental is the notion of struggle and progress which is at the very heart of the idea of the Christian life. Yet to our struggle there is to be a term in proportion as each member becomes more and more truly a loyal subject of the Kingdom, and further in proportion as an ever larger number is being gathered within its bounds. For we must remember, as we saw when considering the question of the Super-Man, that our ideal is in our midst, that we are not waiting for the appearance of some shadowy creature, but have ever before us the type to which we must approximate. The test of the worthiness of the individual member of the Kingdom is the degree in which he approximates to the likeness of its Divine Ruler.

This notion was clear to the mind of St. Paul, who speaks of the Christians as 'with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord,' and being 'transformed into the same image from glory to glory.' Hence it is true there 'remaineth a sabbath rest for the people of God' which is within reach of the grasp of each one of us, though the difficulty of attaining to it is sufficiently emphasized by the conditions under which we now live. It is, however, helpful to contrast this condition of rest with the endless striving by which we are surrounded. It is essentially helpful to try ever more and more clearly to grasp the nature of the goal which has been set before us in proportion as we realize the futility of the aims of those who have rejected it.



It is not easy to escape the conclusion that our highest conceptions of the Kingdom of God here in earth are normally realized within the Catholic Church. It is surely no matter of surprise that the Kingdom should thus have embodied itself, so far as this life is concerned, in a visible society of men. It is not good for man that he should be alone. We may add, perhaps, it is not possible for him to find adequate means of self-expression if he be alone. Only in and among his fellows can he find himself; the very losing of self, which the Gospel demands as a necessary antecedent of self-discovery, is to a certain extent possible only in the form of social existence. Very boldly does St. John write: 'If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'

Whatever our concept of the Church may be, we shall probably be ready to admit that here in earth there are many who belong to its body and yet can claim no membership of its soul, while there are others who, though severed from the visible body, will yet on the last day be recognized as belonging to the soul of the Kingdom. Such indeed is clear from our Lord's words, when He said that many shall come to Him saying:

'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by Thy name, and by Thy name cast out devils, and by Thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from Me, ye that work iniquity';

with which we may compare the other saying:

'Then shall the righteous answer Him, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee an hungred, and fed Thee? or athirst, and gave Thee drink? And when saw we Thee a stranger, and took Thee in? or naked, and clothed Thee? And when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these My brethren, even these least, ye did it unto Me.'

But the Kingdom of Heaven is in our midst; yet, as

we have seen, it is not confined to here and now. It belongs to those mysterious regions which are utterly beyond our ken, but whither, as we hope and believe, we are tending. It is in the oneness of the Body of Christ, which is perhaps only another term for the Kingdom, as it is for the Church, that the many are unified, and the bond of unification can and does extend beyond the sphere of the visible. We are all one in Him, whether here or departed. We cannot weep for the dead as those who are without hope, neither may we assert that all communication between us and them is impossible. It is clear that Christianity can give no countenance to the somewhat degraded practices of Spiritualism, of which we hear so much nowadays, and which appear to be working great injury to many. But in that mysterious communion with the unseen which we call prayer, and which does not essentially consist in petition—in this mysterious communion there is also some possibility of being in touch with those who have gone before us. It is a large universe which the Kingdom opens up, and with almost every corner of it we must have contact. It is easy to see the impossibility of the notion that death of necessity implies a cessation of membership in the Kingdom, and how it rather suggests only a fuller fruition of the privileges which that membership involves. But membership in the Kingdom, that new birth by water and the Spirit, is conditioned by the acceptance of the Person of our Lord, Who is Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life. And so it cannot surprise us that in His teaching we find some word of help and of encouragement in respect of that awful moment of transition when we are to pass from that part of the Kingdom which is militant here in earth to that other part which inhabits the dim mysterious spheres beyond our ken. It is in the last dread moment that He by Whom we entered the Kingdom here in earth is to be our stay and our guide and our help. And as we become more and more conscious of the coming of that dread day, whether it be by reason of the loss of those who are dear to us or of the consciousness of our own approaching end, we become more and more deeply impressed by

the awful potentiality of nearness to our Lord, which the notion of the Kingdom has taught us. We turn our eyes from the visible world towards the setting sun, and there we see dimly the figure of One like unto a Son of Man, but filled full with divine grace. It is He Who is our King and our God ; He Who is our Lord and our Brother, made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted. More and more distant grow the murmurs and the rumours of new ideas and new conceptions with which the modern world is rife, while across the gulf of the ages comes an echo of the words which He Himself uttered by the grave of one to whom He was attached by every tie of human friendship : ' I am the Resurrection and the Life : He that believeth on Me, though he die, yet shall he live : and whosoever liveth and believeth on Me shall never die.' And as our eyes dwell for a moment on the vast extent of the Kingdom and the divers types of men and women who have been gathered into it, we gain yet further assurance from those other gracious words of our Master : ' In My Father's house are many mansions : if it were not so, I would have told you ; I go to prepare a place for you.'

---

#### ART. V.—THE TRAINING AND EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS.

*The Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders.* Report, with Notes, Appendices, and Recommendations presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Committee appointed by His Grace, at the Request of the Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, to consider the Question of the Supply and Training of Candidates for the Sacred Ministry. June 1908. (Poole : W. H. Hunt.)

And many other Papers and Memoranda.

[It is proposed in a series of articles in this and the October number of the *Review* to consider the questions



which arise out of the Resolutions of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury in reference to the training and examination of ordination candidates. The articles are written independently and each writer is responsible only for his own contribution.—ED. C.Q.R.]

## I.

WE are constantly told that the present is a time of unrest in matters of education, and it cannot be denied that the statement is true. It is a common failing of such times that they give rise to a great deal of random criticism and talk, so that the purpose of education, not to mention the practice of it, is apt to be overlooked in the hurry of discussion. It is easy to see that this has happened to a great extent in the discussion of public school education. There is no clear common ground amongst the disputants. Everyone says that education is expensive, and according to their own special interests they criticize it. One man says the education of his boys has cost so much, but he never finds any of them sitting down to read Thucydides or Vergil for pleasure. He is interested in the Classics. Another complains that his boys know nothing of Shakespeare. He is interested in English Literature. Another is interested in Science, and complains that his boys know nothing of the laws of gravity or the dentition of the pig. And the hasty answer to all these criticisms is that somehow or other all subjects, the absence of which anybody deplores, must be got into the curriculum of the unfortunate boys of the future.

A somewhat similar position has arisen in regard to the training of the clergy, with perhaps greater reason, because the Church of England has been conspicuous amongst other ecclesiastical bodies in requiring practically no training for those to whom it entrusts the delicate work of a priest. The only canonical requirement, as far as we can remember, is a knowledge of the Latin tongue. There is, therefore, great justification for an attempt to consider and to build up a system by which the clergy may be definitely prepared

for the work they have to do ; and it ought to be easier from the very fact that there is no traditional established system to dislodge. The theological colleges have been acting independently to a large extent ; the universities have taken different lines—in most of them there is no recognized method for training the clergy as such, though there is in the older universities, and in some of the newer, a Faculty of Theology. There is then a certain hopefulness about the attempt to formulate some principles and scheme for the training of the clergy. But it cannot be denied that some of the less fortunate phenomena of the discussion about the boys' schools are repeated in the discussion of clerical education. Here again we find persons with particular interests angry and clamorous because the subject that is near their hearts is not required of all candidates for ordination. There are the persons interested in 'social questions.' These loudly demand that all candidates should be instructed in economics. Others demand that they shall all be instructed in the practice of teaching in elementary schools. Others claim that they must all be prepared to be abreast of the criticism which comes from natural or historical science. All these persons can make out a plausible case ; but it appears to the present writer that the first axiom of any reasonable educational method is that all these subjects, however interesting and valuable, cannot possibly be expected of all candidates. It will be agreed that those of the clergy who deal with such subjects as these with imperfect knowledge had much better have left them alone, and few if any persons are capable of dealing with more than one or two of them in any but an imperfect way. Further, they belong, if we may say so, to the external and public side of clerical life, that which catches the public eye. The ordinary work of the parson—his ordinary visiting, especially of the sick, his ordinary teaching for baptism or confirmation—does not really make a demand upon him as a rule for these things. It will be explained later what appears to us to be the proper way of dealing with them. At present it seems desirable to consider first what are the main bases of the larger part

of clerical work, and how candidates can best be prepared for these.

In an ordinary parish, country or town, we suppose that the clergy are engaged to a large extent in visiting, especially visiting the sick. They will have to prepare candidates for confirmation, perhaps also for baptism. They will have to preach ; and probably also take classes of various kinds, at least in Lent, and perhaps also in Advent. There will be courses of instruction based on the Bible or Prayer Book all the year round, and so on. Any knowledge, of whatever kind, that a clergyman possesses, will prove useful in some one or other of these functions. But it appears plain that the absolutely indispensable knowledge is that of the Bible and the Prayer Book. Without these, the clergyman is not prepared for the most necessary and continuous part of his work. The Bible is, or ought to be, the source of the doctrine which he teaches ; and the Prayer Book is not only a series of forms of public worship which he is obliged to read in church, but it is to some extent a manual of devotion for the Church of England. If these books are to be used in a proper way, it is obvious that they must be known extremely well. We should not like to bring back again the old uncritical worship of the Bible, as it may be called ; but it is clearly a misfortune that the knowledge of the Bible as a whole has greatly decreased throughout the whole Church. It is probable that few persons when they are ordained have ever read it through, or have any comprehensive knowledge of, let us say, the Prophets. They may possibly be familiar with the Lessons read in church, though the habit of reading or hearing the Daily Lessons is unlikely to have been of very long standing ; but the old-fashioned knowledge of the Bible is probably now a rare possession. In like manner with the Prayer Book : it is probably less common than it was for people to find the devotional guidance of their lives in the Prayer Book as it stands. There are doubtless many reasons for this ; and one of the strongest seems to us to be the nature of the examinations to which candidates look forward. An examination, especially an



examination conducted by a central authority, tends to gravitate towards subjects, and methods of treating them, which make examination easy. Moreover, the most successful of the central examinations, the Universities' Preliminary Examination, started with the assumption that it is impossible to examine in doctrine. Of course, it follows from this that the interest of the examination must turn on points of language, or criticism, or history, which easily form the subjects of questions, and give rise to answers that may be marked as right or wrong. The condition of opinion in the Church of England does no doubt give an added weight to the principle on which the Universities' Preliminary Examination was started, and indeed it is this rather than any inherent difficulty in examining in doctrine which makes the principle look so plausible. It is easy to ask a man a question as to the history of the Gospels or the Acts, or to ask him the various changes, with dates, through which particular services passed in the Prayer Book; and if difference of opinion is to be left out of sight in the examination—and in a central examination it probably must be—then these are the things which naturally form the main subject of the papers. Also, it has been said in their favour that a knowledge of some of them is probably necessary to the full understanding of the Bible and Prayer Book; but it is an inversion of the due order of things if this kind of knowledge takes the first place and colours the whole examination, affecting thereby, of course, the whole method of preparation. It is surely of first importance that the clergy, whatever else they know, should have a full practical knowledge of the Bible and the Prayer Book.

It seems very doubtful whether the best result will ever be attained by a central examination. As we have already noted, the tendency of a central examination must necessarily be towards the indifferent things. Knowledge of the kind that is really required would probably best be tested by the bishops themselves, and it is probable also that the right kind of examination for this purpose would be largely, though not entirely, *viva voce*.

It will be noted, that nothing has been said so far of a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. We venture to think that there is some unreality in the current opinions on this subject. It is no doubt desirable that every clergyman should be able to refer to the original for guidance in any question of exegesis, but it is far more difficult than is popularly supposed to attain this ideal. When candidates for Holy Orders have to get up a special book for their examination, they have some commentary recommended to them for study. There are splendid commentaries in existence on some of the books of the Bible, and the waste places are gradually being covered. But it may be doubted whether the scholarship of such books has any reality for a large number of the readers. Questions of reading, questions of grammar and criticism are to a large extent meaningless. They can get them up, and reproduce discussions so far as their memory serves, but the knowledge is not real or vital; it is not the application of principles independently known and valued to the Old and New Testaments; it is the mere 'memorizing' of fragments belonging to totally alien subjects. They do not know the nature or the value of the science of textual and grammatical criticism; they are aware that questions of this sort are apt to be asked, and they endeavour to cope with the situation by learning notes by heart. It would, no doubt, be undesirable to omit the original languages altogether from the requirements for Ordination candidates, but it is unreasonable to expect, at any rate in the present condition of things, a high standard of scholarship. The drift of opinion in educational matters is not such as to lead us to hope for much improvement in this direction. Hebrew has long disappeared from the curriculum of almost all schools, and Greek will probably follow it soon. It will then be impossible to count on any definite knowledge of Greek, except in the minority of cases; candidates for Holy Orders will have to acquire a knowledge of Greek, as they now have to learn Hebrew, with special reference to their examination. It will therefore be impossible to fix the standard of scholarship at a level proper only to a time when education was mainly classical. The

mischievousness of the change is considerably modified by the existence of two complete Versions of the Bible in English, the Authorized and the Revised. Whatever may be said against the Revised Version, it is an admirable commentary upon the Authorized Version. And people with a comparatively small knowledge of the originals can obtain a very considerable knowledge of the meaning of the text, by means of a careful use of the two Versions side by side.

All candidates would be expected to satisfy their bishop as to their general knowledge of the Bible and Prayer Book ; but they would also be expected to offer some other special subject or subjects—probably not more than two, or produce evidence of their proficiency that the bishop could recognize. There would necessarily be a great variety of these alternatives, for Theology is a very wide subject with many ramifications. But in view of the difficulty of getting a proper examination in some of the more outlying regions, it might be well to limit the area of choice. There would be, of course, the original languages of the Bible, Hebrew and Greek, especially Hellenistic Greek, also the criticism of the Old and New Testaments. There would be the history of Doctrine and the outward history of the Church. There would be the whole field of Evidences ; the relation of Christianity to other religions, from the point of view of the student of comparative religion and that of the missionary ; the questions of the existence of God, Freedom of Will, and the like. Then there are the various social questions, in which so much interest is now professed, those connected with education, temperance and other moral problems, and the use of wealth. It is idle to expect every clergyman to possess a real knowledge of all of them ; and it is worse than useless to encourage men to acquire a smattering for examination purposes. But if the subjects were chosen and offered by the candidates themselves it would be reasonable to expect them to reach a really good standard in their examination.

It would be manifestly impossible for the examining chaplains of any bishop to cover all this ground, but there are many examinations in the country which they could



recognize. The Church should use the universities in all subjects possible. Besides Oxford and Cambridge, there are now Theological Faculties in London, Durham, Manchester, and Wales, and in connexion with London full Theological courses at King's College, London. Bristol, and we hope other universities, will probably develop in the same directions. The use of these would save trouble to a variety of persons in a variety of ways, especially to the authorities of Theological Colleges, and would make it possible to require a really high standard in the most necessary and practical subjects of a parson's life.

THOMAS B. STRONG.

## II.

TEN years ago it might properly have been supposed that the supply of candidates for the ministry was falling off. The number of clergy ordained was certainly diminishing, and the position was alarming. At the present time, though the position remains serious, it cannot be said that the cause of the seriousness is a decline in the number of men who wish to give themselves to the priesthood. Investigation over a wider field than that which was scrutinized ten years ago shews that the vocations are there, and that men are eager to respond to them. The old shortage was largely due to the fact that the ministry was being recruited from a diminishing area of the population; and, more and more, great and growing classes were being excluded by the financial demands made upon parents for the training of their sons. The changes which had taken place in the universities and public schools had had the effect of depriving many a poor home of its opportunity of sending up a son to school and college to be trained for the ministry. The ancient endowments that were given for this purpose, among others, were diverted from the poor to the rich, and from the men of average ability, who could qualify, to men of exceptional ability who could win scholarships, or to men whose parents could secure for them an elaborate and expensive preparation for school or college. This change,

together with the general fall in clerical incomes, was paralyzing, especially to the clergy.

At the present time we can see where the failure has been, and why it is that we have lost so many men for the ministry. We can also see that there is a much larger supply of them available than we are at present utilizing. The seriousness of the position lies in the fact that we are not prepared to deal with them; that even when men press forward for ordination and demand opportunity of training, we are not at present adequately equipped, or adequately organized, for providing them with the training necessary. We have learned, in short, a few of the lessons of our failure, and are beginning to make up a little for what has been lost; but there are many lessons which still remain to be learned, and a great deficiency still to be overcome.

The questions that press at the present time are of two sorts—first, financial, and secondly, educational. It is necessary that the Church should make new ways by which the man who comes from a poor home may get a thorough training for the priesthood. Many of the old avenues have been blocked or diverted, and they cannot now be recovered; therefore new avenues must be opened. To some small extent this has been done in the course of the last ten years by the collection of money for individuals or institutions, or by the establishment of funds, diocesan or general. Some of these are reserved specially for candidates for the mission field, and this fact constitutes a peculiar circumstance which must be dealt with later on. All that has been done hitherto, however, is merely tentative, and must lead the way to something much more systematic if further impending disaster is to be averted.

The training of clergy must be made one of the primary charges upon church finance. We can no longer expect the whole of the clergy to come from a class that is sufficiently wealthy to be able to provide the money required for a long and adequate training. Such a plan never worked satisfactorily, and theoretically it was always unjustifiable. The sooner it is seen to be absolutely inadmissible the better. The Church then in some form or another will take

up the financial responsibility of training its clergy, whenever it is necessary. An annual contribution for this end ought to be just as much a regular charge upon each congregation as an annual contribution for the general diocesan fund, or for foreign missions. It may be sufficient for the moment to state the matter in this form. It would be necessary to go deeper into the question of church finance to state it at all adequately, for in fact diocesan and parochial finance, as a whole, is in a very chaotic state. Congregations have very little sense of obligation to their diocese, or to the Church as a whole; individuals have very little sense of their obligations to their church and congregation: everybody does what is right in his own eyes, or, if he prefers, does it not. Some systematizing of the collections which are now universally taken Sunday by Sunday is an essential feature in the programme of church reform. It would also be well if the upkeep of the church and its services was entirely paid for independently of the weekly collections by a system of voluntary rate or the like; then the weekly collections could be devoted on some systematic plan to the broader needs of the Church. A great movement to effect this change is going on, though at present it is only in its early stages. Where the scheme has been tried, not only have the church expenses been met very adequately by a Sustentation Fund, or some such system of contribution or rating, independently of the weekly collection; but concurrently the weekly collections themselves, being devoted to extraneous objects of real and general interest, have actually increased in amount. Without pursuing this topic further, we may insist that the support of candidates for the ministry should be one of the first claims upon any system of church finance, whether reformed or unreformed.

There is much to be said for a Diocesan Fund devoted to this purpose, which should be worked in connexion with a committee for selecting and encouraging candidates. The diocese is a proper unit for this, and a diocese which has thus sought out and trained its men may well claim from them, even in our present conditions, a definite period of service under the bishop's direction. But a diocesan



system can never be complete. We have not a diocesan system of training in Theological Colleges or Seminaries, and we are not likely to have one. There is no need, therefore, to consider whether diocesan colleges, training strictly for the diocese, would provide a better system than our present one, or a worse. But it is important to note that any diocesan committee, in existing circumstances, will have to be prepared to send its candidates and pay for them at colleges, of very varying ways of life and levels of theological thought, lying outside the diocese.

Thus the Diocesan Fund, adequately supported and wisely administered, gives the essentials of a real machine which in time will be perfected and do good work. Even in its present tentative form it deserves much more encouragement than it receives from the laity of the diocese ; and it may well be hoped that it will soon supersede the more sensational method by which individual bishops or others write an appeal on behalf of particular individuals or initials, and benefit the favoured few at the expense of a general system designed on behalf of all. But there will probably always be a place for other supplementary funds, which maintain a steady appeal for the same object in somewhat different ways and to a somewhat different public.

We turn now from the financial to the educational side of the matter, and reach the most difficult part of the present problem. The discovery of the candidates is not now difficult, and the finding of the necessary money ought not to be difficult ; but it must be difficult to sift the candidates, and to secure for each the sort of training which is best for him. It may be assumed without fear of contradiction that the methods of training need to be very various, not only on theological grounds, but on others widely separated from theology. Three parts of the work may be distinguished from one another : (a) there is the preliminary testing of the candidate before any definite responsibility is incurred on his behalf : the young men ought to be known in advance, and ought to be encouraged and helped, while reporting themselves at intervals or otherwise coming into touch with the authorities who are supervising their training ; (b) there is

the general education needed as an introduction to (c) the study of theology and the technical training for the work of the ministry.

If we consider first the large class of men who are able to pay for their own training, and who hitherto have provided the bulk of the clergy, there is not much to be noted in respect of them. The ordinary circumstances of their life give them, as a rule, a public school education, followed by a career at the university, which ends in a degree. The second requirement is then amply fulfilled ; but it may be doubted whether, as it is, the first requirement is really sufficiently considered. However slow young men of the wealthier classes may be to make up their minds as regards their career, and however reticent they may be in speaking of what lies nearest their heart in such matters, there is room for more to be done, both at school and at the university, in the way of encouragement and help for men who are thinking, or who may be led to think, of the priesthood as a call to them from God. So far as the third requirement is concerned, the question must be raised whether the usual year now spent by many at a Theological College, for theological, devotional and technical training, can in any way be regarded as sufficient. It is an immense gain that it has now been secured in most instances. The view that a university degree was sufficient preparation, or even the view that a theological course at a university was adequate, is now more and more being discredited. No doubt the first object at which to aim is the insistence that every man should have at least a year's technical training, for there are still some that have none, and among them are many of the more intellectual clergy, college dons and schoolmasters, who still come to the priesthood largely without proper theological, pastoral, technical and devotional training. But meanwhile more facilities ought to be given for a longer time of training. The brief period of a year gives very little opportunity for obtaining theological knowledge, or even for cultivating a habit of theological reading. It is never far removed from the danger of cram ; and the result of it may now be seen in the present state of the junior clergy as a

whole, who are enthusiastic workers, zealous and whole-hearted in their practical labours, but not theologians, not convincing preachers, not interested in theological aspects of life in which the laity are interested, not as well trained for their purpose nor as interested in general matters as the average doctor or lawyer. We venture to think that a great opportunity was missed when the new graduate college at Cheshunt started upon lines similar to those of the already existing graduate colleges. If arrangements had been made for a two years' theological course there, it would have been differentiated from the rest, and would have provided men (especially the abler men who, with some justification, despise the ordinary theological college course of one year) with an opportunity which now nowhere exists in theological colleges for a fuller and more adequate professional training.

In this division of the subject it will be well to call attention to a surviving danger which all the improvement in clerical ideals during the last half-century and more has not obviated so much as is supposed. There is still a real danger of the acceptance of unfitted men merely because they have been educated by their parents 'for the Church,' are of blameless character, and have the necessary degree and college testimonials. The theological college course, no doubt, eliminates some of these, and more would be eliminated and saved from a lifelong mistake, or from causing a scandal, if such a course were required of all. In that interest then, as well as in others, the need for this being made an absolute requirement must be pressed. There will probably still be cases that will not be sifted out by such a course of further probation and training. But these must be left to the bishop's handling, and his final discretion and choice must have more universal recognition and more willing deference paid to it.

We turn next to consider the men who will need the Church's financial help as well as its direction in the matters of education; who therefore are more immediately at the disposal of the Church, and for whom it is more directly responsible. The provision for them is not only quite inadequate in quantity, but, for the most part, in quality

as well. A two years' course at a non-graduate college cannot be said to be an adequate preparation. It is liable to fail in all the three requirements laid down above—by lack of previous supervision, of general education, and of adequate theological training. It must not be forgotten indeed that the present standard is an improvement on the previous state of things ; but further steps of improvement are absolutely necessary. The man who has had little preliminary education must be given it, so that his deficiency is made up ; otherwise he will remain to the end less effective than he should be.

The training institutions that at present exist for the most part are only open to receive him from his eighteenth year onwards. It is necessary that these should be supplemented below, that there should be schemes for prolonging the education of the boy who receives his call at 14 or 15 and has so far had little schooling or unsuitable schooling, or perhaps has even left school already. Side by side with his school, or at any rate with his preparation, if it has to be made by him not at a school but during the intervals of business hours, there should be more organized supervision and more definite encouragement from the authorities to whom he attaches himself. This is the simplest case of all. Moreover, as national facilities for education increase, the Church will be relieved of the duty of providing education for any lad who is promising enough to aspire to the ministry, at any rate so far as the earlier part of secondary education is concerned. It will be, however, and is at the present time, bound to make provision for him during the later stages of secondary education (where parents are unable to do so), in order that he may be prepared for his collegiate life later on, and not be lost meanwhile for want of opportunity to continue his studies. A good general education is what is required for him, and this can fairly easily be found if the money for his support is forthcoming.

More difficult questions arise with the man who receives or realizes his call rather later—say at 16 or 17 years of age—and has meanwhile left school and taken up some occupation, if he is to be rightly prepared for his collegiate life ; for he



must continue his studies side by side with his occupation, or else he must be put back again to school in view of the new prospect which is opening out in front of him. Here again both money and guidance with supervision will be required. In many cases the former alternative will be very difficult for the candidates in country places and in small towns, though in larger places there is little difficulty in obtaining the needful evening classes, except in Greek. There is much, therefore, telling in favour of the latter alternative. In good secondary schools there are plenty of facilities for obtaining the necessary training, though in the matter of Greek the facilities are diminishing steadily as years go on. This diminution is likely in the near future to cause difficulty, and perhaps even to make it necessary for the Church to support or favour suitable schools where education in Greek can be had, and to enable them to stand fast by this branch of education. Whether this is done or not, it seems inevitable that the present requirement of two ancient languages should be waived in the case of men who have received an education which is above the average, though in other than classical or theological subjects. For instance, a man who has taken a B.Sc. degree with honours should be excused either Latin or Greek. If two languages are undertaken, it is better that Hebrew should be one of them; because of the opening which that gives into a Semitic atmosphere of language and thought. In any case, the Greek that is learned for purely theological purposes without any previous training in the classics should be Hellenistic and later Greek; and it should be scientifically studied as a language which has a grammar, a syntax, and a value of its own, widely current and with centuries of history of its own, not as a degraded variant of 'classical Greek.'

The earliest collegiate training that is open begins at 18; though at Kelham a man can begin earlier with a system of education which blends the theological and the general in one. This Kelham system has many points in its favour, though it runs counter to the traditional line of development, namely that Arts should precede Theology.

It is very desirable that a place for it should be maintained in the Church's scheme, as a valuable variation, to say the least. The normal course, however, will be—from 18 onwards—a training in Arts or Science leading up to a university degree, followed by a separate period of theological training. It is much to be desired that existing non-graduate colleges should be able to extend their scheme and period of training, so as to include both these elements, and work in connexion with some university. When a student is ready to begin as young as 18 there is no difficulty in this matter. The experiments at Mirfield and at St. Chad's have already shewn this. They have opened university and theological training to men who would not otherwise have had it, working in conjunction with the Universities at Leeds and Durham. But so far as size goes, these experiments are entirely inadequate to meet the present need. The accommodation for men of this sort ought to be doubled or trebled as soon as may be, and meanwhile minor variations in the plan ought to be secured in the interest of variety and experiment. The new University at Bristol affords a chance which ought not to be neglected; a college there, dealing mainly with the west of England, gratuitously providing university education, and connecting with some graduate theological college, or else itself including the theological training, ought to be undertaken without any delay. There is room for the extension of the same system at Birmingham, and probably also at Liverpool and Sheffield. By such multiplication as this, adequate provision might be made for the man who has received his call in time to be able to start his collegiate course at 18.

A difficult problem is presented by the man who receives his call later. A youth of 18 or 20 can well afford five or six years of his time for preparation, always supposing that the money is found for him by the Church. It is not so with a man whose call is deferred later—say until he is 25; yet even for him the two years' course provided at existing non-graduate Theological Colleges is dangerously short. He needs, as much as his younger brother, the general education which *ex hypothesi* he has not hitherto had; and it is difficult

to admit that anything short of a four years' training can be satisfactory, whether two years be spent first in general education and then two in theology, or whether the whole four be spent in a blend of the two on the Kelham model. Here is one of the chief deficiencies of the present time, yet it is one that might easily be remedied. If one of the existing non-graduate colleges were to set the lead, were to remodel its course on such lines as these, and claim of the Church the necessary financial support, others would be led to follow suit; the men already in hand would be better trained, the system would grow, and in time a vast number of men, and valuable men, whose call only becomes clear to them between 20 and 30, would be saved for the ministry instead of being lost, as is now the case.

It seems doubtful whether after reaching the age of 30 men should be accepted as candidates for the ministry, except in very unusual circumstances; at any rate it is probably true to say that the Church need not contemplate making itself responsible for them. Many of the best of those who are now in that case are men who would have become conscious of their call, and would have responded to it, earlier in life, had the way been open to them; and the more the way is open to such men now, the less there will be henceforth of those whose appreciation of their call, or opportunity for following it, is so long delayed.

Turning now to the question of missionary studentships, we can but express a strong opinion that missionary vocations to the priesthood ought not to be differentiated from the general call to the ministry in any of the earlier stages of preparation. The ministry is all one. A man does not necessarily know, when he first becomes conscious of a call, whether he is to work at home or abroad. A state of things in which an offer to go abroad is a man's only chance of obtaining the priesthood is liable to lead to disastrous results. Such has been the position of things till recently, and in consequence men have been ordained for foreign service who really had no special vocation for that, but only for the ordinary home ministry. Other difficulties, of less magnitude indeed but still puzzling, have also arisen, and make

the administration of the Missionary Studentship Fund a delicate and often a disappointing task on the present lines. Once grant that the priesthood is open to everyone, and it becomes clear that the missionary vocation may for the purposes of training best be regarded as something superposed upon the ordinary vocation, and therefore that any such special training as the missionary requires for foreign work ought to be superposed upon the general training. It would be a vast gain in organization if missionary colleges were open only to those who had already received their ordinary training, and were to concern themselves only with the special training needful for the missionary; and if similarly the funds available in the hands of diocesan bodies or missionary societies for enriching the missionary staff of clergy were devoted purely to this further training for the mission field, and not to the general training for the priesthood. Some really adequate missionary training might then be set on foot and supported by missionary money. The technical training of the missionary is of supreme importance and covers a wide field. One or two thoroughly well equipped missionary colleges, devoting themselves purely and quite scientifically to the special topics required for colonial or missionary work, would be a right supplement to the general system of clerical education open to all who seemed to have a call.

Lastly, some further reform is needed in the closing stage of training by which candidates for the ministry are tested. The present system of bishops' examinations is cumbrous, uneven, and unsatisfactory. Some approximations to something better have been made, but more needs to be done. The Church needs a guarantee that the men to be ordained should have had adequate intellectual and technical training. This should not vary from one diocese to another, and the testing of it might be carried out far more easily than at present by a universal and central examination taking place in connexion with each Embertide, to which all candidates for the ministry would present themselves, taking the examination preferably in several portions rather than all at once. The bishops naturally



would each need an opportunity to satisfy themselves separately as to the candidates that presented themselves to them, but the burden of this scrutiny would be much lightened by the general technical examination, and it would be able to proceed less on intellectual lines and more on technical and spiritual. By multiplying centres at which the general examination could be taken, much money and trouble might further be saved.

But this is not all. Together with co-ordination and rearrangement, and the development of existing plans, we need a great deal yet of fresh experiment. We must not be afraid of trying novelties; for example, there must be more use of the newer universities and less clinging to conservative methods in sending men at great cost to the older universities who would be both more suitably and more economically trained at the newer universities. Further, we must not be surprised or dejected if some of the novelties prove unsuccessful. They will probably not be more so than some of the undertakings which we are allowing to prolong an ineffective existence now. Above all, it is imperative that the Church as a whole should be awakened to a sense of its responsibility for the discovering, encouraging, training, and financing of the vast number of its fine sons who are eager in heart to respond to a call which they have heard, but hardly dare recognize or mention because of the atmosphere of discouragement with which the Church, through its insensibility, its class prejudice, and its parsimony, has enveloped them hitherto.

W. H. FRERE.

### III.

THE appointment by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1907 of a committee for the purpose of investigating and reporting on the supply and training of candidates for Holy Orders will probably be found to have been a turning-point in the attitude of the Church of England towards this important problem. The Report issued by the committee constituted a loud call to the Church for more thorough and systematic

procedure; and the call has been responded to by the bishops of the Southern Convocation in their resolutions requiring that after 1917 all candidates shall be graduates of some university, and shall have spent at least one year in a Theological College.

Without binding ourselves down to an immediate assent to the general enforcement of these proposed regulations, we can see abundant reason for supporting the principle and lines of development which the bishops of the Southern Province have set before the Church.

The recent and widespread extension of facilities for university education means that graduation at a university is going to play a much greater part than it has done in the past in the qualifications of men for the various callings in life; and it is obviously necessary that the vocation which places men in the position of pastors and teachers should not have a less rigorous standard of qualification than that which is considered to be necessary, or at least desirable, for other vocations.

Again, the fact that steps have been, and are being taken to secure a high standard for the qualification of men who are ordained to the ministry in Churches which are in communion with our Church, constitutes a clear summons to us to raise our own standard.

Similarly, the regulations which govern the training of men who are ordained to minister in other religious bodies are such that, unless the Church of England raises the standard of its requirements, there will be no guarantee that the general body of its clergy will be able to hold their own intellectually with those of the other Churches.<sup>1</sup>

Our present system appears to be open to at least two criticisms: (1) There is an absence of governing principle. (2) The intellectual standard is deficient.

'We have no uniform principle.' The criticism is justified by the mere fact that, during the years 1902-6, 144 non-graduates appear to have been ordained without even a Theological College course.<sup>2</sup> This must be regarded

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the *Report of the Committee*, Appendices X, XIX, XX.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the *Report*, Appendix XVIII.

as something more than an over-liberal allowance for exceptional cases. Again, 'The intellectual standard is deficient.' It is not easy to believe that the 1134 graduates who were ordained without a Theological College course during the same years were adequately equipped for their ministry of teaching. The number of graduates who passed through a Theological College was 1133. Freedom from a rigid subjection to a cast-iron system is doubtless desirable, but a percentage of fifty betokens something more than discretionary treatment of exceptional cases.

The perusal of such facts as these will probably be sufficient to arouse general sympathy with the determination of the Southern bishops to secure a more uniform system and a more effective training for candidates for the ministry.

The first requirement which they are prepared to enforce is that all candidates shall be graduates of some university. A few years ago the requirement of graduation would have involved a most serious diminution in the number of candidates and an undesirable limitation in respect of social class. It was the failure of the universities to provide for the Church's need of men which led in the middle of last century to the rise of the non-graduate system. But the circumstances have been greatly changed by the development of university education. The Universities of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, Bristol, and the University of Wales have opened wide the door of higher education to men whose means are small. It is true that the opportunities provided by these universities have not as yet been much used by candidates for the ministry. But the causes of this phenomenon are fairly obvious: it is due partly to the fact that the non-graduate system has held the field as the recognized alternative to graduation at the older universities, and partly to the non-religious and non-residential character of the Provincial universities.

What seems to be needed is that the non-graduate training should cease to be recognized as a normal system. These younger universities will then assume a new importance, and the prejudice created by their secular and

non-residential character will give way to an eager pursuit of the opportunities which they offer.

And it is for this that the Church must prepare. The advantages of corporate residential life and of religious atmosphere and discipline could be secured by the establishment of hostels at the various university centres.<sup>1</sup> The universities would welcome such co-operation on the part of Churchmen, and the Church would turn to good use opportunities which are at present being largely neglected.

It is obvious that if the non-graduate system (as normal) is to be abandoned, the additional supply of graduates required to make up the deficiency must come, in the main, from the Provincial universities, and it is therefore imperative that the Church should take immediate steps to make the Provincial university training as effective as possible. In the working out of the details of a scheme, questions will arise as to the nature of the function which the proposed hostels will be intended to fulfil. In this connexion, two principles appeal to the present writer as worthy of careful consideration: (1) The hostels should be open to men of any Faculty and preparing for any vocation. Not the least part of their value would consist in the bringing of candidates for the ministry into close contact with candidates for other professions. The one requirement should be conformity to the religious and general discipline of the hostel. (2) The hostels should not attempt the work of the Theological Colleges. The latter ought to possess an atmosphere which it would be hard, and probably undesirable, to maintain in a general hostel. But this is a detail: the main point is that the opportunities are lying ready to hand; and there is no necessity for the resolution of the bishops to be regarded as a counsel of perfection.

The suggestion has been made that the raising of the standard of general education should be secured, not by the abolition of the non-graduate system, but by the extension of the non-graduate course. But against this must be set the fact that graduation (except in the case of 'External

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the recommendation of the Archbishop's Committee, *Report*, p. 25.



Students' of the University of London) represents a great deal more than the mere study for, and passing of, certain examinations. It stands also for the general testing and development of a man's character and belief in the open and keen atmosphere of a university. And, this being so, the extension of a Theological College course, so as to cover general as well as theological education, cannot be regarded as an adequate substitute for graduation.

The requirement of graduation ought not to be so rigid as to admit of no exceptional cases; but such exceptions ought to be individual and not categorical, and to be so exceptional as to be few and obvious.

No disparagement is intended of the good work done by men trained under the non-graduate system; but the fact that they have rendered good service to the Church does not constitute any proof that their service would not have been even more effective if they had had the advantage of a university education. It is a recognized fact that the sphere of a non-graduate is a more limited one than that of the graduate; and so far from this being mere sentiment which can and ought to be lived down, the signs of the time point in the direction of the distinction becoming even greater in the future.

The other requirement proposed by the bishops is that all candidates shall spend one year at least at a Theological College. Graduation is not in itself to be regarded as a sufficient qualification for the ministry. In addition to the general education, there must be an adequate process of special preparation, mental, moral, and spiritual, and of professional training.<sup>1</sup> While allowing for exceptional cases, and for the anticipation of such special preparation, which is possible for undergraduates at the older universities,<sup>2</sup> it must, the writer thinks, be admitted that residence at a Theological College is normally desirable.

The functions of a Theological College may be regarded as three: (1) the testing and proving of character and vocation; (2) the training of character; (3) the provision

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the *Report*, pp. 18 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the *Report*, p. 17.

of the special teaching and training which are required for the ministerial office. And it is difficult to see how these necessities can be adequately provided for if residence in a Theological College is dispensed with. The other professions do not admit men within their ranks without the addition of such special preparation; and the demands which the clerical profession makes both upon the character and the knowledge of its members ought to be met by a corresponding attention to the distinctive preparation which such demands require. Theoretically, such preparation can doubtless be obtained without residence at a Theological College. An individual here and there will be found who has added to a general theological course the systematic study of Anglican theology, who has learned the principles of voice production, who has acquired knowledge of the principles of teaching, who has (through experience and intercourse with parochial clergy) made himself familiar with the principles and methods of pastoral work. Moreover, it would be a slander against the large body of clergy who have been ordained without a Theological College course, and against the general body of the laity, to assert that residence in a Theological College is a *sine qua non* for the development of the devotional life. And further, if the Diaconate comes to be more fully recognized as a preparatory office, and the period of the Diaconate to be more generally regarded as a continuation of the preparation rather than as a commencement of the priesthood, with one or two limitations, it will not be so necessary, as it appears to be now, for the professional training to be completely secured before ordination to the Diaconate.

But, while giving full weight to all these considerations, we shall probably feel that the Theological College course will have to be the normal means of securing the minimum of special preparation which is desirable before a man commences his ministry; and this, if for no other reason, because it will secure at least one year of systematic effort. The tendency in the case of the man who is allowed to present himself for ordination without such a course is

to 'get up' the necessary subjects for the Bishop's Examination in the shortest possible time.

The whole plan of the bishops, if carried out, obviously calls for rearrangement and development of our organization; and it is desirable that we should take stock of the equipment which is already at the disposal of the Church for this purpose.

Basing a calculation on the statistics given in Appendix XX of the *Report*, and allowing for some Diocesan Hostels and Colleges (e.g. Bishop Auckland, Manchester, Liverpool, Cheshunt) which are not mentioned, we find that there are (roughly speaking) 750 students in our Theological Colleges, excluding those colleges which are specially devoted to the training of missionaries. The largest number of deacons ordained in any one year in recent times (*viz.* in 1886) was 814: and in 1907 the number had dropped to 587.

If, therefore, the non-graduate training ceases to be normal, and the existing non-graduate colleges become Theological Colleges, under a new system requiring graduation as a preliminary to the special training, it appears that the Church possesses a fairly adequate equipment for present needs, as far as the special training is concerned. Effort will have to be concentrated upon the provision of residential hostels at the Provincial university centres. The task is a great one, but its difficulties are rendered less formidable by the fact that the Provincial universities have been planted in our great commercial centres, any one of which should be able to provide all the money required for the commencement of the work. A carefully devised scheme, authoritatively commended and energetically presented to the Churchmen at these centres of wealth and industry, should not make its appeal in vain. The business man who wants a graduate in his office would see the necessity of helping to start a scheme which aims at giving him a graduate in the pulpit.

The scheme would probably be one for gradual development. The work could be started by the appointment of a pastor or chaplain, who should be a centre of influence amongst Church students. The next step might be the

securing of a building with a chapel and large room, where meetings could be held and lectures given. By some such means as these the gradual approach might be made towards the desired goal.

To return from detail to principle, the great necessity which lies upon Churchmen is that of recognizing the demands of changed circumstances. Twenty years ago non-graduate training appeared to be both expedient and necessary. The present day is one of transition: the non-graduate system is still largely employed, but the men trained under it are making considerable use of the facilities for university recognition which are offered by Durham University. Moreover, the rise of the new universities has brought higher education within the reach of men generally. By the year 1917, we may reasonably hope, the voluntary movement in the direction of obtaining university education will have advanced to such a point that the proposals of the Southern bishops will be regarded as expressing the general attitude of the Church.

A. J. TAIT.

#### IV.

TRAINING for ordination must be conditioned by two main considerations, each of a somewhat complex kind: (1) the character of the work required; (2) the character and position of the men who are to be trained for it. No apology ought to be necessary for dealing with a subject like this upon theory, for it is a matter which takes us at once down to the root of all things, and it can be understood only by being so treated. If the *details* of a man's training are wrong, he will make many mistakes before he can readjust himself properly to the requirements of his work; but if the training is wrong *in idea, in spirit, in principle*, he will never get at grips with his work at all until or unless he is able entirely to reconstitute his mind. To anyone who knows the lay mind, and especially the young lay mind, is not its present confused, bewildered condition on religious questions, on what Christianity means, warning enough



for us to reconsider our teaching? And if we are willing to consider it, this appalling state of religious confusion, especially in the non-religious or semi-religious circles, must be kept before us.

Theories may be right or wrong, practical or unpractical, sensible or foolish, but every theory to whichever class it belongs is nothing more than an intellectual 'view' of some subject as a whole, of the way in which its parts, its methods, its details, are related to some end or principle which underlies them, and from which follow the laws governing the details. It is the primary end of education to accustom a man to the 'feel' of theories, to enable him to understand and use them, so that in all the absorption of his work, in all the adjustments he has to make, he may never lose sight of what he wants to reach. Education is so essentially a matter of theory that to attain any success at all, even to keep any life in it, one must have the theory of the business constantly in mind, the end constantly in view. There is nothing in which it is easier to content oneself with hearing set lessons on the getting up of set books, with the delivery of set lectures and the testing of acquired knowledge by set papers; and if one is not constantly asking oneself what all these things are set for, watching closely how far the assumed end is being attained, there is nothing in which an uncalculating routine is so swiftly fatal.

The education of the clergy is from this point of view an educational question of threefold intensity. We are not merely, in the first place, educating somebody; we are educating men who are almost above everything education-alists. If we could regard the clergy merely as specially devout laymen, commending a simple gospel by the example of their own lives and the earnestness of their own devotional feeling, or if, on the other hand, we could be content to consider only a purely sacerdotal ministry of grace, we need take no great trouble over the intellectual demands. The ministry is, however, not less than the ministry of the WORD.

There is no sense in which the term 'education' can

be used which does not apply directly to the clerical function. Certainly, if we may assume the definition given above, the Christian faith is offered to us as a theory or view or vision of life as a whole, that which sets before us the end or purpose to which all we do is related, by which it is explained, to which it is to be directed. By this view human faculties are not only to be guided and directed to what in life is worth doing, but trained, disciplined, developed, for an eternal satisfaction and perfection. The Christian faith is an education for the life to come.

No one at all likely to read these pages will, we feel sure, do anything but applaud these irreproachable sentiments—and yawn over them. And this is the complete expression of our own religious position. To speak of Christ as the Light of the world, Christianity as its illumination, is irreproachable, for if Christianity means anything it means that ; but we yawn, for we have no idea what ‘that’ does mean. The religion we have in use is not a help in the world, but a refuge from it ; it is not concerned with the individual’s work, but with his personality. Our faith—such as it is—has not overcome the world, but it does enable us to escape it successfully. The world is split into many interests, governed by many forces. Business is ruled by economic laws and financiers (a law to themselves) ; politics are ruled by votes, halfpenny papers, and the party clubs. The physical world stands solid under natural forces, adapted to our use by medical men and engineers. Driven by the critics from its one objective ground of Holy Scripture, there is still left to religion the inexpugnable stronghold of religious experiences, not of course entirely without effect in the world ; for does not religion inculcate, sanction, enforce a lofty standard of moral duty ?

These experiences are of course as diverse as the diversities of human temperament, and the religiously minded group themselves in uneasy difference, for the situation is none too assured. Only a short while ago it looked as though the inexpugnable stronghold of experience was to be stormed by psychological invaders, and the last word has not yet been said.

The religious people can, however, for the moment take care of themselves. It is a much more serious matter when we come to consider the effect of our general attitude upon those of a non-religious temperament, who are after all the great mass. To their cheery outward-looking minds the interests and activities of the world appeal very strongly, but they have little inclination for introspection or faculty for states of feeling. We may set on one side the purely selfish pleasure-seekers, the natural product of an age which has lost the power of understanding values, which no longer has a vision of ends. But we must consider the really sincere, clean-living, effective, not unearnest people who are our chief problem. Their religious creed is of importance, and it may be summed under five heads: (1) They have a tremendous belief in morality, in being 'a-good-sort-all-round,' and they have a firm conviction, not apparently unreasonable, that morality can stand on its own feet, or anyhow on theirs. (2) With this there is a vague theistic belief, or rather hope, that there is a Providence somewhere, —though nobody really knows what—who, or which, will manage to pull things right in the end. We none of us know where we are going, but it is pleasant to be alive, active and useful. (3) They are entirely indifferent to all theological statements which seem to them to stand in no relation to anything in which they are interested, and about the grounds for which they are consequently content to be sceptical. (4) They have a strong dislike and incapacity for emotionalism and the 'pious,' for in their experience these are not unconnected with a certain weakness and ineffectiveness of character. (5) Religion, if it does not mean being pious, is supposed to mean (*vulgariter*) a 'fire-insurance'—something to do with the next world. 'Salvation' is always taken by them in this sense, as curiously enough it is also by religious people, with disastrous consequences.

What has all this got to do with clerical training? Surely everything. First, it is the position we have to prepare men to face. Its five articles are the challenge our Christianity has to take up. Further, our present clerical

training has partly arisen from, is partly responsible for, our views of Christianity. It is, as always, difficult to say which is cause and which effect, but undoubtedly there is a close connexion between them.

Let us consider what this training of the clergy actually is. About 70 per cent. are graduates who have mostly completed their education in some purely secular subject. About half of these go up for ordination on their own reading. The rest take a year at a graduate Theological College. Those who do not go to a university spend two years at a non-graduate college purely in Theology. The intellectual preparation of all is dominated by the examination requirements. The non-graduates take the Universities' Preliminary Examination for Holy Orders, which requires a fair knowledge of the Bible and Prayer Book, the history of Creeds and Articles with some knowledge of their contents, and a bowing acquaintance with some fragments of Church History. The questions set are on a high level, but no one is expected to do, or does, more than get up a few textbooks, and the system of marking questions, believed to be necessary owing to the uneducated state of the men, successfully ensures that this strange ideal shall be adhered to. The graduates take only the Bishop's Examination, which has the same subjects, the same character, but a lower standard.

There is no profession which so absolutely demands deep professional thoughtfulness, and there is none which puts its standard so incredibly low. The colleges provide an invaluable spiritual training, but virtually there is no sense that an intellectual side exists. Many of these young ordinands are pious, and many are 'a-good-sort-all-round.' When the college has done its best, they are both, but they have no more idea of what Christianity is than the non-religious mass referred to above. The graduates are not even aware that such a question needs to be asked. Certainly they do not possess an answer, nor are anxious to search for one. The notion that Christianity contains a view of life as a whole has never occurred to them. The non-graduates—to tell the plain truth—are



mostly too uneducated to know what such vague phrases would imply.

In this one-sided account of Hamlet we have omitted all reference to the Prince of Denmark, an omission which must be at once remedied. A certain proportion of graduates take theology as their degree subject; a very few men take it as a second subject. Although the number of students is too small to affect the general average of capacity, the university theological school is of dominant importance as providing the university ideal of theology, and consequently the ideal pursued also at Theological Colleges.

We must then ask what help university theology gives a man in meeting the world-challenge, in seeing what Christianity has to do with the world and its working interests. The syllabuses of course vary a good deal. Scriptural studies are the primary requisite. We begin with Hebrew, a most exacting study, necessary to enable the student to follow the detailed arguments on the documentary sources of the Old Testament books. Then follows the documentary criticism itself, the historical criticism, the historical reconstruction, and a somewhat perfunctory discussion of the theological ideas. The order given is that of relative emphasis. In the New Testament the course is much the same. The language is already more familiar, but there is much more textual criticism, and the theological part, the study of ideas, is much more carefully done.

Next there is the historical section—the History of the Church and the History of Doctrine, in some way not easy to follow forming separate subjects. Doctrinal subjects are too risky to handle freely. Sometimes there is a valuable section on ‘Philosophical Theology,’ but it does not go further than Theism. The philosophy of the Atonement or the Incarnation is not attempted. London insists on a study of Comparative Religions, that is, heathen religions. The Scottish universities and most of the Nonconformist colleges have a long course of Systematic Theology, mainly Scriptural and patristic. The English colleges do not venture on so wide a field. Some, however, very significantly, allow for study of a ‘Special Doctrine,’ such as the Trinity,

Incarnation, Atonement, or Grace (Augustinianism), taken separately. Each of these requires the getting up of certain authoritative patristic texts in the original.

What, I believe, most people feel about the course is that the student has learned a great deal too much, relatively speaking, and thought a great deal too little. The usual result, with a successful student, is to leave his mind an utter chaos. He is exceedingly well up in the critical examination of evidence for certain past happenings, but has given little attention to their significance, and hardly any to the difference they make now they have happened. He has a very clear idea what Origen, Athanasius, and Anselm thought about certain Christian doctrines, but an exceedingly vague idea what he thinks himself, and no idea at all what his scout or bedmaker thinks. He is sufficiently enlightened to see where the ordinary devout Christianity is wrong, but he is quite in the dark as to where it is right, or how to make it more right. He has built a huge pyramid of theological learning. The top does not quite reach to heaven, perhaps owing to an unfortunate confusion of tongues, but it contains only one room, and that a tomb.

Let us try how it works in a parish. If the cobbler begins to quote the result of Biblical criticism, or the doctor argues materialism, they will find they have met their match. But these are rare pleasures. The example of the non-religious man given above is the normal product of public school Christianity, turned out by the hundred. The working-class attitude is a little, but not seriously, different. In general such men have no desire to argue. If they do, their arguments are a deliberately misleading game, some second-hand clap-trap they have picked up, not the expression of their minds. They have not rejected Christianity, and they have no doubts. They know hardly anything about it, and, as explained above, they do not see that it is concerned with anything they are interested in. As the curate does not see either, he is not in a position to give much help. As a man he possesses just the stock of spiritual earnestness which belongs to the religious. If that does not appeal to the man he meets, if he cannot work the latter round on to

his own ground, he has nothing further to say, for he has no spiritual hold on the other man's ground. Cobbling souls and healing bodies, politics (the cobbling of constitutions) and economics (the health of the community), though plainly parts of the will of God, are not religion; anyhow, neither the Hebrew lectures, the documentary hypothesis, not even the Synoptic theory and Ur-Marcus, throw any light on them. In the appeal the curate can make, and in the retreat he will have to make, all his 'theology' has left him just where he was before except that he can no longer throw Scripture about with the effective vehemence his grandfather might have used. As the Scottish professor said, 'we have no thought-out position,' and a thought-out position, if it included a thought-out reference to human businesses, is just what might have been of some service.

If we are not on the right line, what is that right line? I maintain that the solution must begin by recognizing that the non-religious man is not only the man to be reached, but the man to be learned from, the man who is far more on the right road than the religious man. I carry my paradox defiantly on. The stupid people are far nearer the heart and know the road of education better than the clever; just as the rough uncultured poor are very generally far nearer the heart of manners and morals than the cultured. The reason is quite simple. Polished manners are not the same as love and considerateness, but only the forms thereof. Learning and mental culture are not the same as education, nor are piety and religion the same as the love of God. To the gentleman, the scholar and the pious, in the joy of their several accomplishments, the forms are very apt to become an end in themselves, the substitutes, the idols, then the antitheses, of the real thing. Wherefore it is written, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit (faculty?), for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' The accomplished are meant to be the teachers of the plain and stupid, but they must first learn of them.

If there is any truth in the Gospel principle that he that loveth his soul shall lose it, our non-religious man's outward-looking interest in the work God has given him to do, his

disinclination for introspection, inability to maintain states of feeling, are not at all unhealthy or undesirable. We ought not to try to lever him up on to some other ground, but meet him where he is, and he is not at all unready to be met. His vague theistic idea is a clear recognition that his own little life and work are only fragments of a great whole, carried forward, not only with a purpose of its own but with a power of its own, which is indeed using him, little as he knows or can know of what it is all making for. This is, one may say, not only a sound basis for theology, but a much sounder basis than making God describe an orbit about oneself and one's own 'experiences,' which is not at all uncommon.

But if a sound basis to start from, it is a very dangerous position to rest in. The religious man is in imminent peril of making God the ground of satisfaction in his own piety, the joy of his own emotion. The non-religious man, ignoring God, remains in his own avowed heathen self-confidence. The unknown something is too unreal to lead him away from himself, which is the true salvation. When all real sense of end and purpose are lost, comfort is the only assured reality. Irresponsible pleasure-seeking grows apace.

I repeat, therefore, my point. The non-religious man is on the right road, the road by which we all ought to go, but he will never get far up it unless the religious man, having first humbly accepted it, uses his own great and special gifts in shewing the common man whither it goes and how to travel on it. Christianity alone by the Incarnation of the Son of God can give valid force to that theistic truth that all the variety of the world is one in God's purpose; Christianity alone can offer in the Passion an intelligible view of man's place in that purpose. It is the true business of theology to work this out, to shew how all the variety of human life, interest, activity, thought, are bound in one about the throne of God through the life of Christ. But this theology, I repeat also, is not the theology taught and studied.

I do not think there is anyone who is not painfully conscious of the defects of our theological position and



method. Why then do not so many able and deeply earnest men find a remedy? The explanation of the difficulty is made plain by its history. In the Middle Ages theology was the key and centre of all science and of all life. Logic and philosophy, art and natural science, politics and law, if not created were at least inspired, stimulated, carried on, as they found in it a place and motive for themselves. It was a true, a great and noble, conception, but it could not last. The several sciences felt they had possibilities which they could not work out unless they were set free to follow their own lines independently. And this also was true. Say what we will, human interests and pursuits are humanly different. Politics is not banking, nor law medicine, nor astronomy a form of ethics. The universities are the proper place for the perfecting of human knowledge, and the road of its perfection is by specialization.

The new universities have accepted this frankly, the older universities practically, though with much demur, for it can hardly be denied that the situation has become desperately confusing. After all, though it contains diverse things, life is a whole and the diversities take from it their meaning and value; but that whole no one any longer knows where to find or even look for. Is it elegance and culture, or philosophy; is it one science or the full number of all? Theologians, professors and students, together with the man-in-the-street, are all swimming in the most different directions in a boundless sea, calling vainly to one another as they get further apart, knowing nothing of where they may get to, but only that if they do not keep swimming they will sink. The young Divinity student has specialized in Old Testament, Synoptics, Paulines and Justin Martyr; after dealing similarly with Tertullian, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, Cyril, Abelard, Aquinas, Ockham, the Reformers, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, he hopes to emerge with a real answer to the cobbler. The professor justifies his metaphysical researches by saying that 'he hopes to find something cheerful.' The naturalists go forward grimly indifferent, for each discovery is an addition to the sum of human knowledge. The students of brewing,

mining, commerce, and engineering are placidly content, for they do find something useful.

Personally I believe this, so far as it goes, to be as right as it is inevitable. Human interests, as men find them, are diverse, and men, themselves but parts, must study them as parts. There is no other way. Mediaeval theology was wrong in this respect that theology is after all humanly conceived, and no one conception can claim to dictate to another ; but modern theology also is wrong, for theology is concerned with the conception of the whole. It cannot therefore reach anything merely as the specialized study of another part. Human studies differ then because it is the infinite divisibility of the Divine Will on which men are engaged, and God only reveals His Will bit by bit through very patient study. My non-religious man was right after all : the purpose of the whole cannot be known. God has revealed in Christ, not His Will but Himself, revealed thereby that there was a Self which was more than an operation ; a Will which was more than actualized force. This does not remove the need of study and labour, and we fully admit it does not explain the end or purpose of the individual's life. But by removing the unknowable from the unknowability of an impersonal system to the unknown thought of a Father made known to us, it has changed it from an empty imagination to the primary and dominant inspiration of life. We do not know what God is doing with our work or with us, but we no longer vaguely hope : we know He knows. The substitution of the shadow of a known Presence for a shadowless speculation is the substitution of a delightful uncertainty for a dull acquiescence. With the knowledge of God it is possible for a man to escape from himself to that faith in God which in truth is salvation ; without that knowledge there is nothing left but the hard, smooth shell of self-confidence in one's own 'straightness,' covering the rotten and often stinking core of pleasure-seeking.

This is simple enough, the essential simplicity of the Gospel, all too easily lost as simple things are apt to be. The thinker and teacher must make sure that he can carry

it on, apply it, under all the complex variety of life men bring with them. It is all very well to know what Origen, soaked in Neo-Platonist philosophy and allegorism, or Gregory of Nyssa with his Aristotelian physics, thought of Christian doctrine, but our minds are soaked in Evolution and scientific experiment. Our view of matter must be affected by the new theory of electrons. The advent of socialism forces on us questions of individual salvation. Politics have not stood still, and man—the man whom Christ died to save—is a political animal. Psychology is a new science, and *psyche* is more or less Greek for the soul (I acquired this information from Liddell and Scott, not from the psychologists). A theology of life must deal with all these things, be able to blend them into one view, in which the doctrine of God and the Incarnation, Original Sin and the Atonement, the Holy Spirit and the meaning of Creation, Predestination and the Theological Virtues, shall be, what they are in God's mind, one whole conception, reflected and set out according to His ordinance for our use in the religion of the Church and Sacraments.

The authorities of the Church have opened a new prospect. They have put out a rule that after a certain date no one shall be ordained without a degree. The determination to ensure so far as possible a sound education demands all our sympathy. Without education, without the power to follow a man's real mind, to measure his real needs, it is almost impossible to help anyone ; but then it is equally impossible to use that power in a subject of which one has no adequate knowledge, and for this knowledge the rule makes no provision. It is true that it requires also ' at least ' a year in a Theological College, but avowedly for the sake of spiritual training, and this is not the same thing.

Many people will maintain that we have laid a great deal too much stress on the purely intellectual side of training, but indeed this side is of dominant importance. Personal sincerity is primary, for without it a man can never get the sense of dealing with realities ; but, though often quite sufficient for a man's personal life, it is quite insufficient if he is to be a teacher of others. Religion is to the clergyman

the absorbing interest and business of his life; to the bulk of his people it can be only the inspiration of an interest and business in quite other directions. This is only the problem of the religious and the non-religious man. The clergy do not fail for lack of earnestness or reality, but because, through lack of scientific training, they cannot follow the principle of their subject through forms other than their own: they can only try to make other people like themselves. I would add that there is no position so full of spiritual danger as that of a man bound to a spiritual occupation to the requirements of which he is not really equal, steadily failing without the power to find out either why he fails or in which direction he might succeed.

The authorities quite rightly recognize that the existing situation is intolerable, but it is our English way to believe that everything is quite simple, if only we have the energy to push up the obvious road, and to resent the labour of seriously considering the nature of the difficulty. To our anti-theoretical mind a theory is everything, and to our practical bias the plainest facts have no weight. It is contended that the universities are the proper centres of all learning, and that secular studies are the foundation on which theology must be built. That moves the whole issue, and the contention is contrary to all experience.

If theology is in the least what we have taken it to be, its very existence makes its pursuit at a university—as universities now are—almost impossible. It is a view of life as a whole, and the universities are less and less accustomed to wholes. The whole practical habit resents the notion of a man touring the schools at large, professing himself profoundly interested in their results and what they are ultimately reaching (the very thing they least like talking about), but unable and unwilling to go through their discipline, desiring to skim the cream of each for purposes of his own. Nor are the men who have graduated in these studies at all inclined to follow what involves not a new application but a new method. They have always worked by detailed study along one line. The notion that from the single point of the Session of Christ at God's right hand,



one might work outwards, sweeping first the ultimate ends of all sciences into one inclusive view, reaching lastly in some fashion to their beginnings, would require them to reconstitute the habit of a mind already formed and set. It is possible for the student who has worked first at the whole to reconstitute what he has done piece by piece in detailed study afterwards. On the other hand it is not possible to build up a view of a whole merely by a study of pieces.

The broad facts no one can or does dispute. We have followed our present road a long time, and this is the *impasse* in which it has landed us. It is said, however, that that is due to the abandonment of the university ideal of the unity of the truth. Theology is not one science among many, but by right the Queen of sciences, and it is for us to stick to the university till we can reform it. Now it is one thing to see the truth of an ancient view, and another to believe that we can put the clock of the world back. The current is very strong. May it not be that there is a truth in the new view also? If so, we shall not recover that ancient truth merely by insisting upon it as though no new factor had arisen. The actual position is that while many theologians maintain the ancient claims, theology is actually worked like anything else as a detailed study of a special sphere. Possibly if, like her King, she left her throne to become the servant of all and to learn of all, would listen more and ask questions, she might get on better with her Master's business.

I too believe that theology should be the Queen of sciences, but it is just the whole brutal truth of the situation that with all our magnificent learning on quasi-theological subjects we have not got a theology. Till we have, trying to reform the dominant idea of a university with the frightened piety of helpless and untaught children bears a suspicious resemblance to the story of the Russian nobleman and the wolves. A really discreet nobleman would lay in a supply of other folks' children.

Nobody professes that we are making any headway at the universities. It may be possible that a true theology

could be taught, but it plainly cannot be formed, in them. The professors say that it is impossible, as things are, to do differently, and there is every reason to take their word for it.

Is any alternative possible? The non-graduate colleges are a confessed failure. Of course they are, and it is just on the line of our unreflecting English mind, a measure of what our education has done for us, that we rest on the bare fact without any inquiry or search for its significance. Imagine yourself in a position of exceptional educational difficulty. Take a number of your least educated men with limited money—for the total cost of the course is about one-third that of the university, and the time allowed about one-half. Obviously you would lay your hands on the most essential things and make sure that at least these were understood; but then we do nothing of the sort. We insist that our men shall fill up the entire time learning all the technical scraps of information we can sweep together, the only use of which is to prepare them for an examination adjusted to pass cram work and discourage thoughtfulness. The resultant failure does not condemn the system so much as once more reveal the theological helplessness which could make such a miserable travesty possible.

To burn your boats at the commencement of an attack is a well-known act of melodramatic heroism; to burn your boats and fritter away your remaining regiments when the whole plan and coherence of the attack are lost is suicidal. Surely this is just the time to be thinking if there is no other way round. Leaving the universities to pursue their own human studies with all the religious help we can provide—since for the moment we can give them no other help—might not at least some of us, with a due proportion of the best students, for it is perhaps only an experiment, be encouraged to try whether we could not think out our theology again quietly by ourselves, content to reform it before we undertake to reform universities? Suppose we begin by reminding our students and ourselves that Christianity is a message to the whole world, and that theology is nothing but the study of Christianity in that relation;

that it cannot be learnt merely by getting up books : it must be thought out.

Is this bound to be a failure, and why ? ' Because theology is a narrow study ? ' Then why call it the Queen of sciences ? Nay, why trouble about Christianity at all ? We had imagined that Christianity had comprehended the world by the comprehension of something beyond it ; that for that reason it was the world which did not comprehend Christianity. ' Because it takes men away from contact with actual life ? ' But is it not admitted that this is true of the existing theology ; that we are in desperate need of a theology of which it shall not be true ; that all experience proves we are not getting it on our present road ? I admit success will not be easy or swift, for we have got to find it.

' But it has been tried in the Roman Seminaries and failed ? ' Once more, is it not worth asking why ? It has not failed, but its success is the terrible alternative I dread to our failure. We are not here merely arguing about details of educational process : we are fighting for the life of Christianity and nations. Call it the modern spirit, or naturalism, or the non-religious man, or what you will, the modern world and modern science will no longer be ruled by theology. It must go its own way. Is it not right ? Is it not following Christ, but is it therefore to follow in darkness ? It is intolerable and impossible that Christianity and the study of Christianity should any longer jostle unregarded in the throng. Two alternatives remain. The religious will inevitably go off into a world of their own, hedged around by Roman encyclicals and Protestant pietisms—the former for preference—or else we must go back to that great central point, Christ sitteth on the right hand of God, find out what it has to say of the Christian interpretation of the world-life, which has for the moment grown too tangled for us as well as for itself,—for no one professes to have any other interpretation—and come back to meet it with a message when we have some idea what the message is.

HERBERT KELLY.

## ART. VI.—THE WOMEN'S CHARTER.

*The Women's Charter of Rights and Liberties.* By LADY McLAREN. Preliminary Draft, 1909. (London: Grant Richards, 1909.)

WHEN the history of the century between 1850 and 1950 comes to be written, though doubtless its record as regards scientific attainments will be little short of amazing, yet this will not blind our eyes to the great social changes which have also been in progress; and among these a conspicuous place must be given to the advance made as regards the position and claims of women.

Many causes have contributed to this. The greater our development in civilization the wider the field becomes for the exercise of powers other than that of brute force. In a great many important departments of life women (once handicapped by physical inferiority) have now almost as great an opening given to them as men. We do not speak of such things as art and literature, but of more practical matters, such as work in factories and houses of business, gardening, work in shops, and other occupations which require skill rather than physical strength or the highest kind of intellectual training. We are also confronted with the fact that there are considerably over a million more women than men in this country, and that while, roughly speaking, only three women out of four are married, or likely to marry, the disparity is far greater among the 'educated' classes than among the very poor. In other words, this means that there are a very large number of intelligent women who can hardly be said to look to marriage as the probable occupation of their maturer years. It is not unnatural that women, so situated, especially when in height, muscular power, and physical development many of them are remarkable 'products' of their generation, should take a somewhat different view of life from their grandmothers, and (deprived as they very often are of the interests and affections of home) should turn their attention



to the welfare of the community at large, or that the influence should spread even to those women who have homes and families of their own, but who are none the less keenly alive to the social evils of the day. The views which some among them entertain have found an embodiment in a pamphlet by Lady McLaren, entitled *The Women's Charter of Rights and Liberties*. In that pamphlet is set forth a list of the principal disadvantages under which women labour, and for which changes in the law of the land are demanded, while (incidentally) the need of granting the Parliamentary Franchise to women is emphasized. The main points are: Coverture; Rights of Maintenance; Earnings; the Wife as Partner; Marriage Contracts; Assaults on Wives; Divorce; Children; Domicile; Marriage Service; Inheritance; Testamentary Power; Education of Girls; Immorality; Measures for Improving the Condition of Married Women of the Working Classes; Factory Acts and Economics; Political Rights.

In reading Lady McLaren's pamphlet, we must own that there are many points on which we feel in sympathy with her. For instance, at p. 11, when she speaks of the impossibility of forcing a husband to work, and the injustice of throwing the whole burden of the family on the wife: 'No one can compel a husband to work. Her only resource is to go to the workhouse with her children and trust to the guardians to sue her husband for her maintenance. It often happens that the guardians find it easier and cheaper to support the wife in the workhouse than to find and prosecute the husband,<sup>1</sup> who in such cases very often disappears and covers his traces. A large proportion of the able-bodied women now in the workhouse are deserted wives. Alteration of the law is needed, which would enable the wife to apply immediately to a magistrate for an order enforcing maintenance. Such maintenance might be

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above we have been informed by a friend who has had long experience as a 'guardian of the poor,' that the suggestion about the wife being able to prosecute at once is quite impracticable; 'where time enough is allowed to prove the desertion, it is enough to allow the man to disappear.'

recoverable from the employers of the husband out of the wages due to him.' Yes, but what if the husband is hopelessly idle, or has run away? Many a poor woman, too, would rather work herself to the bone than go to the workhouse. On the other hand, it does not seem as if much would be gained by sending the man to prison and thus keeping him at the public expense.

In the section entitled 'Women as Mothers' (p. 22), Lady McLaren puts her finger on what is one of the greatest blots on our contemporary civilization—the tragedy of infant mortality. Mr. Roosevelt has warned us with much emphasis on the subject of the declining birth rate; but is not the warning at least equally needed as regards the preservation or destruction of infant life?

We will not follow Lady McLaren into the question of certificated midwives, which is now under discussion in many quarters, further than to say that we quite agree with her that some system of insurance might well be tried which should secure adequate attendance when it was needed.<sup>1</sup>

We find it also stated (p. 23) that if 'by reason of exhaustion a mother cannot feed her children herself, a supply of healthy cow's milk is rarely open to her. The milk sold in town is not only very costly, but it is proved to be full of dirt and germ diseases. . . . Under these circumstances it can surprise no one that the mothers of this country lose nearly half their children before maturity.' Lady McLaren advocates the provision of a 'municipal milk supply'; but here again the question arises of expense which must be borne by the parents of the child, or else provided out of the already overburdened rates. The fact that 'the mothers themselves are often insufficiently fed,' and that about thirty per cent. of the deaths of children in a given year 'are due directly to maternal exhaustion, which prevents the mother either from bearing healthy children or from nourishing them properly,' is one of most serious import. According to Lady McLaren, it seems as if legislation often does as much harm as good. The law forbidding a woman to go to work for four weeks after

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mrs. Bosanquet's *Poor Law Report*, p. 226.

the birth of her child, humane as it is in intention, is, she thinks, very often one of mistaken kindness, as it may very likely mean a diminution of food just when it is most sorely needed. Opinions will probably differ about this. But, in cases like these, we venture to think much more might be done than is done by encouraging thrift and foresight among the poor themselves, and, above all, by endeavouring to discourage, in every possible way, the habit of drink.

A practical suggestion on p. 47, that there should be facilities for washing and cooking outside the home, seems well worth consideration. 'It is an utter waste for one hundred women to organize a hundred small washes in their own houses, when ten women would be able to do the whole of the work in the same time by associated labour.' Municipal kitchens, 'or even the Bouillon establishments in Paris,' also come in for a word of praise. But these things can surely be done without Acts of Parliament.

The present writer has always been very desirous of seeing in this country something like the 'trattoria' system which one meets with abroad, for the benefit of the 'genteel poor.' Take an ordinary English cathedral town, with a collection of small families, chiefly widows and spinsters. They are by no means rich, yet everyone of them has to keep and to pay a separate cook. What a relief it would be to many households if, when one o'clock came, a well-heated tin box were set down in the front hall (as one has seen it in Rome) with a dainty, well-cooked meal, which had not been casting its fragrance before for some hours in the lower regions! How much more would a somewhat similar relief be appreciated by some working women!

While, however, we are heartily in sympathy with much that we find in Lady McLaren's pamphlet, though we are not sure that the cure for the evils is so easily to be found as she implies, yet we fear that we cannot approve of the 'commercial' view (we can use no other word) which she takes of marriage. In the pages of the *Women's Charter* we find (p. 10):

'I do not suggest that an extravagant money value should be placed on those services which women render, but it is only right that a wife who works diligently and devotedly in the family service should be entitled to such wages of a servant or housekeeper as are usual in that station of life in which she lives, and this in addition to her board.'

A marriage such as these pages describe would, we think, begin at the registry office and not improbably end in the Divorce Court. If the relation between man and wife is to be of the hard legal nature thus suggested, we can scarcely wonder that a wish should be expressed (p. 19) for the 'alteration of the marriage service in the Church of England.' We shall have more to say on this subject later on. At the same time, it must be owned that there are some grave hardships connected with the present position of married women and widows, and that not only among the very poor. Take the case of a married woman who 'turns an honest penny' by novel-writing or dress-making. For income-tax purposes she cannot claim an abatement, if her husband's income and her own together are over the prescribed figure; and yet her husband can, if he pleases, leave away all his money from her. Many of these hardships are set forth in the pamphlet before us, and some of them at least appear to cry out for remedy.

The question of divorce is a very difficult and delicate one, and it would be impossible to discuss it in detail here. But we think we are justified in saying that infidelity on the part of a wife is, and has always been held to be, a more serious evil than that on the part of a husband. The honour of the family, the preservation of its integrity, lies with the woman. No one can doubt who is the mother of a child; nature herself has taken care of that; but it is only by confiding in her honour and good faith that the paternity of a child, the transmission of hereditary right, can be proved and secured. On the other hand, is it not greatly the fault of women themselves that male offenders are not socially ostracized? Are they not sometimes, especially in the case of a man of rank and wealth, received in houses whence even a breath of suspicion would exclude



a woman? Mrs. Norton was not perhaps altogether without justification in her complaint that for a supposed, not proved, offence *she* was shunned by society, while the nobleman whose name was linked with hers was well received in the highest circles.

Those who advocate, in the interests of women, that divorce should be made easier, seem to forget that it is, in most cases, far more the woman's interest than the man's that marriage should be made indissoluble. A woman loses her beauty, or her charm, or (as in the Empress Josephine's case) she fails to produce the expected heir. Her husband wearies of her, and seeks a younger and more attractive partner. How great the temptation is to him to catch at any excuse for getting rid of her! Think of the miserable jealousy she must suffer every time a possible rival should cross her path. Think of her pathetic efforts to preserve a beauty that is on the wane. It might surely be added that the knowledge that marriage is (practically) indissoluble, is the only real safeguard against hasty or ill-assorted unions.

We fear we must again differ from Lady McLaren as regards the subject of infanticide and its penalties. There is something, no doubt, infinitely pathetic in the position of a girl-mother accused of this offence; and Sir Walter Scott, in the *Heart of Midlothian*, and George Eliot, in *Adam Bede*, have made it the theme of their most affecting romances. But surely it is well to enforce the pleadings of natural compassion and affection which even the most untaught and ignorant of mothers must feel, by the knowledge that the offence she is tempted to commit is looked on as a very serious thing in the eyes of the State. 'Two years in prison and two years at a reformatory' seem a light punishment indeed for taking away the life of an innocent child. If, on the other hand, the child be allowed to live, its very presence, and the care to be given to it, often teach its mother much-needed lessons, not only of penitence and shame, but of unselfish love and dutifulness to others. It may, and often does, give her a sense of responsibility which nothing else could bring into what

has hitherto been a heedless and careless life. As to the suggestion that the State should provide homes for illegitimate children, it seems to us actually to put a premium on immorality.

Let us, however, turn from these details to the consideration of some broad principles. And first of all we would deprecate the assumption that the remedy for the evils already mentioned is dependent either on legislation or on the success of the movement for Women's Suffrage.

As regards legislation, it seems to be incapable of really meeting economic difficulties ; it is like dealing with the symptoms instead of the source of an evil. Let us take 'sweating' as an example. Legislate against it as we may, so long as there are more workers in the field than there is work for them to do, the difficulty may be shifted, but it cannot be removed. Employers will either find some way of evading the law, or they will cut down the number of their workers, and many will be turned adrift. If a girl is deprived even of the miserable pittance she already earns, how strong does the temptation become to lead an immoral life ! It is not untrue to say that a good deal of the immorality we see around us is due to economic causes ; it is too often the ' line of least resistance ' to a half starving girl, or, sadder still, to the mother of starving children.

There are many more distinguished instances of heroism, but perhaps few more really heroic than that of a girl who works at starvation wage to keep herself honest, when she has all the temptations which are sometimes placed in her way to lead what for a time is an easier life ; or when perhaps in a factory (we speak of no imaginary case) she is persecuted by the attentions of some man who is set over her, and runs the risk of losing her poor livelihood if she displeases him.

After many years' anxious thought on these subjects the conviction has grown stronger in the mind of the writer that the only real remedies for the present state of things are threefold :

1. Emigration (with preparatory industrial training),

2. Temperance on the part of both sexes,

3. Education—religious no less than secular; for if 'character' is one of the greatest 'assets' (one might say *the* greatest) a man or woman can possess, then surely Religion, which alone can really train the character, is indispensable to those whom we seek to aid.

In the *Times* for Friday, June 10, 1910, we find that :

'During the latter part of the session [of the Women's Congress], Lady McLaren expounded her Women's Charter. She claimed that there was an intimate connexion between the suffrage movement and the Women's Charter. Neither would be likely to be completely successful without the other. In the Women's Charter she proposed to put before the world an ideal code of rules governing the relations of men and women and to deal with the needs of women. If the nine Parliamentary Bills which had been read a first time in the House were carried into law, the laws of England would be completely just to women. These Bills had been received with general approbation. Lady McLaren, having briefly explained the objects of the different Bills, said the whole root of happiness lay in giving women an economic independence. Only the woman who could provide food for herself was free.'

Without expressing any opinion as to the desirability of Women's Suffrage, we cannot but feel very doubtful whether, supposing it were granted, it would produce all the good results which are claimed for it; and we may add that, when we consider the progress which has been already made without the suffrage, we feel that we ought not to despair even if the suffrage be not granted to women.

Let us take the one fact that women are now allowed to be members of municipal bodies. Whatever may be thought of a woman's capacity for public life on a large scale, there can be no doubt that she has a splendid field for her energies either as a member of a municipal body or of a Board of Guardians. Details which entirely escape the masculine eye have no chance of eluding her vigilant observation—an observation quickened by that instinctive sympathy with suffering in every form which is the prerogative of her sex. The lady town councillor or the

lady guardian may be said—except that she does not always possess a husband—to be the virtuous woman of the Book of Proverbs come to life amid modern surroundings, so skilful and kindly is she as an administrator, and so truly public spirited is her disposition. Again, it would be difficult to overrate the good which is being done by ‘health-visitors’ (of course, women) in various parts of the country. The diminution in infant mortality since a system of such visiting has been pursued, *e.g.* in Oxford, is most remarkable, and worthy of all gratitude.<sup>1</sup> To such institutions as the Church Army, the Charity Organization Society, and to the various ‘Settlements’ in London, Birmingham, and elsewhere, including the work of the ‘Grey Ladies,’ nothing but the highest praise is due. What we really want is not so much legislation as regeneration.

One word perhaps may be added on what seems a very real danger in the present day—that of bringing up in our midst a feckless and invertebrate poor. Already we have taken into our own hands the education of their children, thus discouraging all attempts on the part of parents to lay by for such a purpose, as was done (with very beneficial effects on the characters of both parents and children) in former days. Similarly we try to relieve them of the care of their parents by Old Age Pensions. We seem in a fair way to deprive them of the duty of feeding their own children. According to Mrs. Bosanquet, in her excellent work on the Poor Law (*c. v.*), it is no uncommon thing to find able-bodied men between twenty-five and fifty who prefer the lazy restraint and dull security of the workhouse to being up and doing in the outside world. We English, both at home and abroad, seem to be always ‘sentimental’ in the wrong place. May we be permitted to quote here some of the admirable and opportune words of the Archbishop of York, in a sermon recently delivered which

<sup>1</sup> The infant mortality rate in Oxford was only 75 per 1000 births during the year 1909. It has rapidly declined since the inauguration of the Oxford ladies’ health-visiting scheme four or five years ago. Before this work was begun, the infants died at the rate of above 100 per 1000 born.



precisely express, but in far better words than most of us could command, the feeling which is daily deepening in the hearts of many among us :

‘This diffusion of kindness of heart is indeed a thing for which to thank God and take courage. It is full of hope ; it is a most cheering indication of the soundness of the heart of the people. Yet it brings its dangers with it. It is apt to spread around us a certain softness and weakness, to loosen the moral fibre, to sap the foundations of resolute endurance and strenuous effort. It may well be that the resources of the community ought to be taxed, and taxed still further, to provide for all those who dwell within its care at least what we may call a platform of chance, of opportunity, upon which they can begin to live a self-respecting life. But there is a danger lest in the process we should allow the idea to spread that all mankind has a right to be comfortable, and that wherever hardship exists there must be some moral wrong. We can see at once the consequences of such a spirit. It will follow that if it is hard for men to discharge their primary duty as parents in providing sustenance for their children they must leave it to the State. If it is hard for men to seek and find work they must look to the State to provide it. If it is hard for men to look ahead and make some provision for sickness or old age they must leave it to the State to furnish it. The increase, or at least the steady maintenance, of a high rate of pauperism which afflicts us all with such a deep sense of disappointment in the midst of all our enthusiasm of social effort, is due not only to economic, but also to moral causes. Let us by all means associate ourselves with the effort to remove the economic causes, but it is most essential that we should remember the place of the moral causes as well. I well remember a conversation with one who had been called from active effort on behalf of the relief of poverty to the administration of the Poor-law, in which he said, pointing to the statistics of the increase of pauperism, “ We have made a great mistake, your people (that is the clergy) and my people (that is those who have been leading the working classes in their efforts to ameliorate their lot) : we have forgotten the unwelcome truth that kindness often involves severity.” The true standard of help for those who need it, commonplace as the statement would seem, is to enable them to help themselves ; to encourage them with fresh hope to bear their own burden rather than to shift it upon other shoulders. Instead

of speaking of the right to be comfortable, the Christian has rather to dwell upon the duty to be noble, to be self-respecting, strenuous, and ready to accept the law of stress and struggle in the moral life. The gospel of comfort which is being so sedulously preached at the present time becomes a danger unless it is checked, disciplined, and deepened by the Gospel of the Cross.<sup>1</sup>

To return once more to the subject of marriage. In the *Women's Charter* a complaint is made that the word 'obey' is still allowed to remain in the marriage service, which in that and other respects 'evidently needs revision.' To put the matter in plain words, the question really is whether marriage should be a kind of legal contract, terminable at will, and absolutely prosaic in its character, or the highest expression of a great natural law that one sex is incomplete without the other, and at the same time a consecration of those physical impulses which are, after all, God's work, a making of what might otherwise be looked on as degrading to be ministerial to the highest spiritual ends.

Now, there can be no doubt that it is the woman who completes the man's life. It is the man who ought to woo her, not she him. In marriage she 'forgets her own people and her father's house,' and assumes her husband's name. She may be said to identify herself with him. And when a woman promises to 'obey' her husband, she is only recognizing the principle that there can only be one head in a family if there is to be any unity and consistency of action. One might go further and say that no really right-minded woman is happy with a man whom she cannot look up to. Most women *like* looking up to somebody, and a woman would rather have a husband whom she was proud of, even if she had occasionally to yield her will to his, than feel—in popular phrase—that she 'could turn him round her finger.'

This first principle being granted, it is only fair, perhaps, to go on to say that it is very fortunate for men, and for domestic felicity in general, that this little word 'obey'

<sup>1</sup> *The Guardian*, June 10, 1910.

still lingers in the marriage service ; for experience of life has shewn us that the power of women, as it is, has something positively 'daemonic' about it. From the closely-veiled Ranees who, from behind the *purdah*, exercises such unaccountable influence in Indian life, to the charming English lady who, apparently passive and unobtrusive, is really the very pulse of the domestic or social machine, the same law holds good. Which of us have not known the distinguished public man, in political, ecclesiastical, or academic life, who has seemed a very tower of strength till his wife died, and who has from that moment gone utterly to pieces, and never held up his head again ?

Perhaps we may be allowed a quotation from our old favourite, Boswell's journal during his visit to the Hebrides.

'Sunday, September 19, 1773. At breakfast Dr. Johnson said:

"Some cunning men choose fools for their wives, thinking to manage them, but they always fail. There is a spaniel fool, and a mule fool. The spaniel fool may be made to do by beating. The mule fool will do neither by words nor blows ; and the spaniel fool often turns mule at last : and suppose a fool to be made to do pretty well, you must have the continual trouble of making her do. Depend upon it, no woman is the worse for sense and knowledge."

'Whether,' says Boswell afterwards, 'he meant merely to say a polite thing, or to give his opinion, I could not be sure ; but he added :

"Men know that women are an over-match for them, and therefore they choose the weakest or most ignorant. If they did not think so, they could not be afraid of women knowing as much as themselves." In justice to the sex, I think it but candid to acknowledge, that in a subsequent conversation, he told me that he was serious in what he had said.'

One peculiarity of women is, that though their power is very great, it is seldom exercised directly upon an object, but usually through some man. For instance, Deborah 'stirs up' Barak, and countless other instances might be given. Isabella of Spain does not discover America, but

she makes it possible for Columbus to do so. Joan of Arc leads men, not women, to the combat. 'Cherchez la femme' has a good as well as a bad side. But it is surely a mistake for people to quote that hackneyed old proverb: 'The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world,' or even Mr. Roosevelt's dictum, that 'the mother is the most important person in the community, she is more important even than the statesman,'<sup>1</sup> as if they expressed the whole of the truth. It is to be feared that our friends the clergy are sometimes rather blameworthy in this respect. In their speeches and sermons they often speak as if the whole well-being and religious life of a family depended on the women. If so, then we can only say 'so much the worse for the family.' After all, fathers *do* count, and they ought to be made to feel that they count. An Englishman is naturally shy and reserved, but surely his wife ought to see that he takes his proper place both in religious and social life. Most young people nowadays, we notice, say 'mother and father,' instead of 'father and mother,' in speaking of their parents.

But the really distressing thing in much of our contemporary literature of the 'progressive' kind is that it seems to be assumed that there is a natural enmity between the sexes, and that the interests of men and women are antagonistic. Granted that in some cases it may be so, as, for instance, in certain trades where women, as compared with men, are placed under unfair and vexatious disadvantages; just as there are other cases where men are 'undersold' by women, *e.g.* we may know many houses where the butler has of late years been displaced by a parlourmaid, not to mention departments of public service where the same kind of thing is taking place—granting all this, yet taking life as a whole, the old laws of nature still prevail. Men *do* love their wives and sisters and daughters, and make great sacrifices for them, and women do the same in their turn. To anyone who has ever belonged to a good and happy home, whether rich or poor, lofty or lowly, there is something indescribably uncongenial (to

<sup>1</sup> *Women's Charter*, p. 46.



use no stronger word) in the attitude of a certain portion of the feminine press towards the masculine half of the world. If it is 'not good for man to be alone,' it is also true that it is very hard for women to be isolated, and to be always on the defensive against the supposed crafts and assaults of the opposite sex, the sex which is as incomplete without them as they are without it.

One feels as if Life were to be turned into a concert in which all the sopranos and altos sang at one time, and all the tenors and basses at another, in which case none of us would know what the real resources of harmony could be.

We have, alas, seen much in the present day of the evils attendant on class-warfare. Millions of money must have been lost to this country,<sup>1</sup> and countless homes made wretched, through strikes. It seems now as if there were symptoms of a 'strike' amongst women. The bitterness with which some women allow themselves to speak of men cannot fail to remind us of some utterances of demagogues intended to inflame the employers against the employed. In a strike, recourse is sometimes had to arbitration. But there is no arbiter possible between the sexes save their own hearts and consciences, and their desire for the public good. That there are difficulties and evils in the condition of women at the present day no one can deny. Upon one of the very darkest of those evils it has seemed impossible to dwell in an article intended for general reading. But our main contention is that it is not what the law does for us, but what, with God's help, we do for ourselves and for one another that really raises the moral and social tone, and eventually affects the life of the whole country. Every rich, pampered, luxurious woman who lets the little world dependent on her see that she has no higher ideal than dress, amusement, and admiration, that she has no idea of time except as a thing to be 'passed' or 'killed' or frittered away, is preaching an eloquent sermon from the devil's pulpit, and will never want an

<sup>1</sup> For a picture of an even sadder state of things in France, see René Bazin's striking novel, *Le Blé qui lève*.

attentive audience. How can we expect poor girls with their hard lives to choose the better part when they see their superiors selling their own souls, or their daughters' souls, for rank and money? When the fashionable world is full of exciting divorce cases, can we wonder that the other classes find married life a source of discontent?

Some who read these pages may share with the writer the privilege of having once known the late Felicia Skene. She was an unforgettable instance of what a woman, not rich, not young (at least as we remember her), not supported by being a member of any highly organized religious order, effected in the city in which she lived, by her single-hearted, loving devotion. She, with her gentle birth and high culture, did not disdain the very humblest details when she was endeavouring to win souls. But it may be doubted if any Act of Parliament, however ingeniously framed, would have the effect of such a character and personality as hers in rescuing the vicious, or supporting the wavering, or helping the weak and ignorant. What we want is more women like her, or may we not say more men and women, when we think, for instance, of the work of a man like the late Father Dolling? The only way really to benefit people in any class or circumstances of life is to get at their souls, and the only way we can get at other people's souls is by giving them our own.

---

ART. VII.—THE RATING OF TITHE RENT-CHARGE  
ATTACHED TO A BENEFICE.

1. *The Law and Practice of Rating.* By EDWARD J. CASTLE, K.C. Fourth Edition. (London: Stevens. 1903.)
2. Royal Commission on Local Taxation. (a) *Reports (Interim)*. (b) *Minutes of Evidence*. (London: Wyman and Sons, Ltd. 1899.)
3. *Reports of the Tithe Rent-Charge Owners' Union.* (London: Published by the Union. 1880-1910.)

4. *First Report of the Incumbents' Fair Rating League.*  
(Published by the League. 1910.)  
And many other Works and Papers.

AN eminent authority on the Law of Rating<sup>1</sup> states that

'There is probably no portion of the laws upon which our social institutions are formed in which an English citizen has more direct and personal interest than that which regulates the incidence of the burden of local taxation: and yet it is hardly too much to say that there is no other branch of law in which the average Englishman exhibits less knowledge and even more apparent indifference.'

The matter of 'the incidence of the burden of local taxation' is, indeed, one that affects very closely the owner of 'Tithe rent-charge not severed from a Benefice,' that is, the incumbent whose income is derived from tithe rent-charge. The system of local taxation which entails upon such persons a contribution of income largely in excess actually and proportionately of that which is contributed by other citizens for local purposes is one of the several causes which go to produce clerical poverty. It will make the matter clearer if the writer states his own experience in three benefices: in two of these, the income of which from tithe rent-charges was 80*l.* and 300*l.* per annum respectively, he was called upon to contribute one-eighth and one-tenth of such income; in the other, the income of which was not derived from tithe rent-charge, he had to contribute one-seventieth only to local rates. This enormous difference, of course, was due to the fact that in the third benefice he was rated only as other citizens, upon his house-assessment, whereas in the other two he paid, as no other citizen does, in addition, upon his tithe rent-charge. The rating of such property is a part of a much larger question, namely, whether it is equitable that one form of property, *viz.* 'real,' should be called upon to bear, as it does, the burden very largely of local taxation. John Stuart Mill was of opinion that 'there was no justice in making those who have

<sup>1</sup> Boyle, *Law of Rating.*

inherited land bear more of the burden than those who have inherited money'; and in a letter, recently published, said:

'It appears to me that when a great alteration is made in institutions which have existed from a very early period of history, any expense, loss, or other inconvenience . . . cannot justly be laid on any one class, but ought to be fairly shared by the whole community who are to benefit by the reform.'

It has been affirmed by a modern economist that 'fairness in taxation means that each class and each individual ought to pay to the revenue in proportion to ability to pay, that each should be called upon to make, as far as practicable, an equal sacrifice in providing the funds needed by the State.'<sup>1</sup> We do not assert that incumbents who are owners of tithe rent-charge form the only class of the community which contributes to local taxation beyond its 'ability to pay;' but we think that it can be shewn, as we shall endeavour to do, that such owners are a conspicuous instance of such contribution, and that in an excessive degree, for the owners of tithe rent-charge have no opportunity, as others have, of adjusting the burden between themselves and others. It is often urged nowadays that the burden upon land since the Act of Elizabeth, which is still the basis of modern rating, is due to the 'national' character of that property; but nothing can be found to substantiate this modern contention. The reasons for the considerable rating of real property lie in the facts (1) that until quite recent times it was practically the only form of property ('personalty' is of quite modern growth), and (2) land being 'visible and tangible' lay open to the overseers when there existed no inquisitorial powers, as now under the Income Tax Acts, for discovering and determining whether the citizen had personal property, and if so to what extent. Evidently he could not be assessed for that which could not be known. Thus, personalty, although equally rateable in theory and in law with realty, escaped taxation, and consequently real property, which could not be hid, was left to bear the brunt of the burden of local taxation. Attempts were made from time to time locally

<sup>1</sup> Herbert Samuel, *Liberalism: its Principles and Proposals* (1902).



(as rate books, e.g. at Maidstone, shew) to rate personal property, but the difficulties were so insuperable that during the seventeenth to the eighteenth centuries it was practically exempt therefrom, with the inevitable result that, as the local demands became heavier, the burden upon real property became more and more excessive. The bearing of these facts upon tithe or tithe rent-charge, as it has become since the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836, is obvious.

We shall endeavour to shew how it has come to pass that owners of tithe rent-charge attached to a benefice are called upon to contribute to local taxation in excess of the contribution of other citizens, and to indicate some methods by which this 'unduly onerous burden,' to quote the official language of the last Royal Commission on local taxation (in 1899), can be, in part at least, removed. It may be urged that this language was used before the passing of the Tithe-Rates Relief Act of that year, by which

'Tithe rent-charge not severed from a benefice was given the same relief as had been given to Agriculturists by the Relief Act of 1896; but the enormous rise of local rates since that time has practically neutralised the relief then given: and the owner of such tithe rent-charge is in much the same position now as he was then, that is, he is paying very nearly if not quite the same proportion of his income in 1910 as he was in 1899, and thus the contribution is still unduly onerous.'<sup>1</sup>

We do not need in our historical survey to go behind the famous Act in the reign of Elizabeth (1601), although a reliable student of the history of local rates is confident that

'In the XIVth. century the accepted view was that each inhabitant should pay according to his ability or substance, *juxta statum et facultates*, for, in those days, ability and substance meant much the same thing, the man who has a large income without having a large capital is a product of modern civilization. Thus in agricultural districts, the acres farmed, and in towns the size of the houses occupied, formed some guide as to ability.'

It is obvious that this is not so now: the man with an

<sup>1</sup> Cannan, *History of Local Rates*.

income of £1000 a year may live in a house assessable at say £20 a year, if he chooses, and will pay only an infinitesimal part of his income to local taxation. The same writer shews that

‘A broad distinction was made between rates levied for relief of the poor, and for other local purposes; persons were called upon to contribute to the poor in proportion to their real ability to contribute, and not according to their ability as measured by the standards in use for other rates.’

The bearing of this ‘distinction’ upon rates as now levied upon tithe rent-charge is obvious. In the last demand for rates levied upon the writer four-fifths of the sum levied were for expenses other than for ‘relief of the poor.’ It is to be noted that the Elizabethan Act was an Act for the pure and simple purpose of meeting the poverty caused by the recent suppression of the monasteries, which had been the ‘Poor-houses’ of the previous times. The Act was thus an Act solely for the Relief of the Poor. It enacted that

*‘The Churchwardens of every parish . . . shall also raise weekly or otherwise by taxation of every inhabitant, parson, vicar and other, and every occupier of lands, houses, tithes impropriate, propriations of tithes, coal mines, or saleable underwoods in the said parish in such competent sum or sums of money as they shall think fit . . . toward the necessary relief of the poor . . . according to the ability of the said parish.’*

From the wording of this Act, it is evident that tithe ‘not severed from a Benefice,’ in so far as it was intended that it should be taxed to the poor, was taxable because it was in the possession of an ‘inhabitant,’ not in that of an ‘occupier’ of tithe. The importance of this distinction will be discussed later. Other ‘inhabitants’ could and did escape taxation by reason of their property not being visible or tangible, not so the parson. ‘It was obvious,’ said Lord Esher in *R. v. Christopherson*, 1885, ‘that his tithe could be easily seen and estimated by the Overseers.’ It is open to serious question indeed whether the parson or vicar was ever, by this Act, intended to be taxed to the poor on his tithe in the gross: he was to be taxed as an ‘inhabitant,’ but only as other

'inhabitants' were to be, as Lord Mansfield affirmed in 1777, '*after providing a competent living for themselves and their family.*' There is no mention of tithe attached to a benefice in that Act. Tithe is mentioned, and the kinds are specified expressly, but neither of those terms applies to such owners. The argument '*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*' applies here, as much as to mines other than 'coal mines,' which previous to 1874 were held to be non-rateable, inasmuch as only coal mines were named in the Elizabethan Statute. In 1762 (Judgement in *Lead Smelting Co. v. Richardson*) Lord Mansfield affirmed that '*the specifying coal mines excluded other sorts of mines.*' The solicitor to the Tithe Commissioners in giving evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1850, said: '*As I read the Poor Laws, in which I have had some little experience, I do not think that originally it was the intention of the Statute of Elizabeth to rate spiritual tithes at all.*' It may be asked, why, then, is there any mention of the parson or vicar therein? Probably, to declare that these were rateable as was every other 'inhabitant,' to make it quite clear that, as such, these were not exempt. It is needful, however, to inquire whether the parson or vicar was, if rateable, to be rated as an 'inhabitant' or as an 'occupier' of tithe. In the case of *R. v. Hopkins* (1673) the rateability of the parson was not based upon his being an occupier of tithe, but there is no doubt that it was gradually assumed that parsons were 'occupiers' of tithes. This assumption was based upon a flagrant misstatement in Dalton's *Country Justice* to the effect that '*Every Clergyman is to be rated for his glebe and tithes according to their yearly value, so long as they are in his own occupation, because the Statute charges every occupier of tithes, &c.*' This blunder was exposed by Lord Justice Lindley in *R. v. Christopherson* in 1885 as '*a misquotation of the Statute of Elizabeth.*' It is quite evident that there is no mention of that kind of tithe at all. Nevertheless, and owing largely to this 'misquotation of the Statute,' the parson has been for centuries treated, not as an inhabitant, but as an occupier, to his great disadvantage. Had he been rated as an inhabitant, according

to his ability, he would have been entitled to deduct his necessary expenses from his income, but as an occupier of tithe he was not allowed to make any such deductions. This distinction may seem, since the Commutation Act, to be of no particular value, for by that Act *'Every rent-charge payable as aforesaid instead of tithes shall be subject to all parliamentary, parochial, county and other rates, charges, and assessments, in like manner as the tithes commuted for such rent-charge have been heretofore subject.'* It seems clear that the old fallacy, based upon, or at any rate supported by, Dalton's 'misquotation of the Elizabethan Statute' is at the root of this modern enactment. In commenting on this clause in the Commutation Act, the Poor Law Commissioners in 1843 stated in their Report that *'there was a distinct understanding at the time in Parliament that the Tithe-owners, in consideration of their acceptance of a fixed, instead of an improvable income, were to be secured against any variation in the mode of taxation which then prevailed.'* The Commission on Local Taxation in 1899 declared that the words *"in like manner as the Tithes commuted for such rent-charge have heretofore been subject"* appear to have been inserted in order to ensure that no fresh liability in respect of assessment should be imposed upon tithe-owners.' There is evidence that long previously to the Commutation Act, spiritual tithe was exempt, in law, from charges other than relief to the poor—for in the Act 23 Hen. VIII such tithes were exempted from the sewers' rate then enacted, whereas inappropriate tithes were rateable. It is difficult to determine to what purposes tithe in the hands of the clergy was rateable at the time of the Commutation, though it is known that there were, in comparison with the present purposes for which local rates are charged, but few such charges upon the rates. It is not within our province to speak particularly of the effect of the Commutation Act upon clerical incomes, but on the whole, it was in itself, and has further proved to have been, by the fall in averages and the rise in rates, to the disadvantage pecuniarily of the tithe owner. Also, the tendency of legislation since 1836 has been against his interests financially, as in the Act of 1886 'to amend the Tithe Commutation Acts



as to Extraordinary Tithe-rent-charge upon hop grounds, orchards, fruit plantations and market gardens.' Three years before the Commutation Act was passed a competent witness was able to state before Sir John Graham's committee, '*From what I have been enabled to see, hear, and read, the clergy are at present receiving an average of one half of the value of their tithes.*' Lord John Russell, in bringing in a Bill having for its end 'the rendering this mode of providing for the clergy more fixed and certain, and calculated to relieve it from that fluctuation, and from those objections to which it has hitherto been subject,' corroborated this statement. But this Commutation Act was based upon the actual receipts, not upon the value of the tithe due, in the seven years preceding A.D. 1836, and during that period the price of cereals happened to be considerably lower than usually. It is true that some attempt was made in Sect. 37 of that Act toward adjustment, but the value of tithe not received could only be hypothetically arrived at, and it would be to the interest of occupiers of lands to underestimate the value of their produce during that period. Mr. Caird, a Tithes Commissioner, stated in 1878 that '*up to the passing of the Commutation Act the income of the Church increased with the increased value yielded by land, the original object being that the Church should progress in material resources in equal proportion with the land.*' But from 1836 to 1878 the rental value of land increased 50 per cent., whereas tithe rent-charge did not so increase in value, and since 1878 it has steadily decreased, falling in 1895 to 59*l.* 12*s.* per 100*l.* The present averages are 70*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.* It was estimated by the same witness that but for that Act tithe owners would have been richer by 2,000,000*l.* per annum. The effect of the Commutation Act may be condensed into a sentence thus: The clergy are receiving less than they would otherwise be receiving, and upon this diminished income they are paying heavier rates. The only thing they gained by the Act was freedom from the vexation and friction of taking and realizing tithe in kind.

In the same year as the Commutation Act was passed, the Parochial Assessments Act also became law. This Act has

had very far-reaching effects upon tithe owners. Its purpose was stated thus :

‘ No rate for the relief of the poor . . . shall be of any force which shall not be made upon an estimate of the net annual value of the several hereditaments rated thereunto, that is to say, of the rent at which the same might reasonably be expected to let from year to year, free of all usual tenants’ rates and taxes, and tithe commutation rent-charge, if any, and deducting therefrom the probable average annual cost of the repairs, insurance, and other expenses, if any, necessary to maintain them in a state to command such rent, *provided always that nothing herein contained shall be construed to alter or affect the principles, or different relative liabilities, if any, according to which different kinds of hereditaments are now by law rateable.*’

It was explained by Lord Denman, in *R. v. Lumsdaine*, (1838) thus : ‘ *The object of this Act does not appear to have been to introduce any new principle of rating, but to affirm that which already had been established by decisions of this Court.*’

The question, however, at once arises, Would anyone take a tithe rent-charge at its gross value, minus the statutable deductions, if he had to perform himself, or by deputy, the duties with which that property is charged ? The attempt has been made, but in vain, to let a lease of such rent-charge. And yet, in case after case, judgement has been given upon this very assumption that a hypothetical tenant would do so. Such a tenant remains purely a hypothetical person ! In view of decisions based upon this imaginary assumption, it is not surprising to find it stated in the Report on Local Taxation (1899) that ‘ *sufficient allowance is not made for the fact that persons entitled to this rent-charge are under legal obligation to render services, and to perform duties in return therefor.*’

It must be borne in mind that the ‘ net annual value ’ of land does not represent the gross annual value thereof. The tenant allows in the rent which he is willing to pay for the value of his own labour, and the cost of working the land, in addition to the charges of rates, etc., thereon. In

R. v. Trustees of the Duke of Bridgwater (1829) it was declared that

‘The value of the occupation or rent paid by the person, as a farmer, is not, however, supposed to be the value of the land or of its produce minus the expense of producing it, but the value after deducting the expenses of cultivation and of the farmer’s subsistence. The principle of our decision is that the same rule is to be applied to all occupiers.’

It is estimated that the occupier of land pays as rent, and is therefore rateable upon only one-half or possibly one-third of its *gross* annual value. In equity it seems that the clerical tithe owner should be rated upon not more than this. It has been said that, since the Rates Relief Act of 1899, the clerical tithe owner is only rated upon half of his rent-charge; but the reply is: he is still rated, as other occupiers of land are not, upon practically *half of the gross annual value* of his tithe rent-charge, whereas farmers are rated, by the Rates Act of 1896, upon *one-quarter* or *one-sixth* of the gross annual value of the land they occupy. This difference is, of course, due largely to the fact that the incumbent is not allowed, as the farmer is, to subtract, before the net annual value is arrived at, for ‘*his personal labour withdrawn from other profitable occupations*’ which in R. v. Capel (1840) Lord Denman allowed to a landlord-occupier. In the case of R. v. Joddrell (1830) the principle was laid down that

*‘Tithe-owners were only rateable for that proportion of the value of their tithe which the rent received by the landlord for all the land in the parish bore to the whole annual value of such land, including the profits of the tenant: if the rent is one half or two thirds of the total annual profit and value of land, then the rate on all other property should be one half or two thirds of its annual value.’*

Had this decision been upheld, the clerical tithe owner would have been relieved of one-half or two-thirds of his rateable value. It was, however, overruled in R. v. Capel (1840).

We must say something concerning the proviso in the Parochial Assessment Act of 1836: ‘*provided that nothing*

*herein contained shall be construed to alter or affect the principles or different relative liabilities, if any, according to which different kinds of hereditaments may now by law be rated.*' The history of the wording of part of this proviso is of considerable importance. As originally drafted, at the instance of those interested in tithe rent-charge, and with the full agreement of the Government, the original proviso had in place of the words '*or relative liabilities*' the phrase '*or proportion.*' Without any parliamentary discussion, no one knows how or where these original words, which were deliberately intended to safeguard the interests of the tithe owners, were altered. The intention of the proviso, even as altered, was distinctly stated in a circular of the Poor Law Commissioners in 1837 thus: '*It is understood that the proviso at the end of the first section of the Parochial Assessments Act is intended to preserve to the tithe owner the benefit of the decision in R. v. Joddrell.*' Notwithstanding, Lord Denman, in *R. v. Capel*, three years later, decided against tithe owners, affirming that '*the Court could not take into account the alleged intention of an Act of Parliament, unless adequately expressed therein.*' We are not surprised at the words of the Leader of the House of Commons in 1899 that '*in his opinion the intentions of the Legislature from the Act of Elizabeth downwards, had been steadily thwarted by the Courts of Law, and that the Courts had not truly nor accurately interpreted the intentions of the Legislature.*' The Commissioners on Local Taxation in 1899 reported thus: '*The tithe owner is held by the judgement in R. v. Capel to be rateable under the provisions of an Act which are not suitable to such a property, and upon a basis which results in his contributing upon a higher percentage of gross value.*'

Two chief questions arose out of the Parochial Assessments Act. First, was stock-in-trade, *i.e.*, ultimately, personal property, rateable? In 1839 the case *R. v. Lumsdaine* came before the Court, and Lord Denman held that it was so rateable. The result of this decision was a panic, and at once, in 1840, an Act was hurried through Parliament which statutorily relieved personalty from rating. The measure was intended, pending further legislation, as a



purely temporary measure—to expire on December 31, 1841. It has been, however, continued ever since, although in 1899 Mr. Lloyd George stated in the House of Commons that '*the whole matter of local rating was unfair, unequal, and inequitable.*' This Act '*dealt a deathblow at the requirement of the Elizabethan Act of rateability on the basis of ability.*' Again a proviso was attached to this Relief Act, and again wholly to the disadvantage of the tithe owner. The proviso ran thus :

' Provided that nothing in this Act contained shall in any wise affect the liability of any parson or vicar, or of any occupier of lands, houses, tithes impropriate, propriations of tithes, coal mines, or saleable underwoods, to be taxed under the provisions of the said Acts for and towards the relief of the poor.'

The 'parson or vicar' was rightly regarded, in accordance with the Elizabethan Act, as an 'inhabitant,' and not as an 'occupier' of tithe attached to a Benefice, and yet the 'parson or vicar' was expressly exempted from the relief afforded by this Act to all other 'inhabitants.' He was *classed* as an 'inhabitant,' but treated as an 'occupier.' The clergy concerned made a strong protest, and only acquiesced in the proviso and the decision in *R. v. Capel* under the express and specific understanding that their claim would be brought under the consideration of the legislature. They had to wait until A.D. 1899! and then only received relief which did not touch the root of their grievance.

The second question which arose out of the Parochial Assessments Act was whether it allowed a deduction, before arriving at the 'net annual value,' equivalent to that which in practice had been allowed when personal property was rateable legally, *viz.* for '*providing a competent living for themselves and family,*' as Lord Mansfield had determined in 1777. In *R. v. Capel* the Judge found that 'the language in the proviso of that Act was very artificial, and loose to a degree, which rendered the discovery of a definite meaning to all its parts extremely difficult.' It was therefore decided that no deduction for personal services could be made in arriving at the 'net annual value' of tithe rent-charge.

This adverse decision would not, however, have proved so vexatious and burdensome had the words in that Act, 'for relief of the poor,' been strictly adhered to. The Poor Law Commissioners of 1843 said :

*'It becomes, after the commutation, inconsistent with that principle which regulates taxation by the benefit derivable from a tax, that the tithe owner should be forced to contribute, as such, to any new rate, or to any addition to those old rates which may be imposed for the improvement of property.'*

But, notwithstanding this assertion, the tithe owner is called upon to pay towards certain of the 112 purposes which have been statutably charged from 1869 to 1899, although the chief of these, Education, Highways, Police, Lunatics, as well as 'Poor Relief,' have been declared by the last Commission on Local Taxation to be 'National' rather than local purposes. Toward the £56,000,000 required for these five purposes, in 1904-5 local rates were called upon to contribute 74 per cent. and the Imperial Exchequer only 26 per cent. A 'national' object was defined by the last Commission to be *'one which the State insists upon being carried out, and on a certain standard of efficiency.'* This has an important bearing upon the tithe owner as being called upon to contribute so largely and excessively toward local taxation, and it is interesting to note that politicians of all parties are becoming more and more agreed upon the growing necessity of some readjustment between 'national' and local charges. The present Prime Minister has quite recently said that *'until we have settled on something like scientific and rational lines what services ought to be locally paid for, and what services ought to be centrally and imperially paid for, we shall never have a true settlement of these questions.'*

Within the last few years two Acts have been passed which directly or indirectly bear upon the rating of clerical tithe rent-charge. The first was the Rate Relief Act of 1899. This has mitigated the burden of the incidence of local taxation for such owners, although, as has been shewn, the considerable and rapid rise in rates since that date has, to a large extent, defeated the

intentions of the legislature. It is true to say that, even with the deductions under that Act, a larger sum is being contributed by such owners to local taxation than was paid at the time when that Act was passed. And in very many parts of the country, especially in the eastern counties, and in towns, this increase is very considerable. In the agricultural parish with which the writer is concerned, in the west of England, the rates on tithe rent-charge between 1898 and 1910 have increased 110 per cent. The other Act referred to is the Budget of 1907, by which a distinction was drawn between income-tax on 'earned' and 'unearned incomes,' earned incomes being taxed 25 per cent. lower than unearned. The principle allowed hereby is of importance, inasmuch as if tithe rent-charge can be shewn to be, as we think it can be, *earned income*, then some allowance should be allowed on it before assessing it to local rating. The principle is allowed to some extent in the Rates Relief Act, since only tithe attached to a Benefice is allowed relief, but that Act does not go deep enough, as we hold, because it does not really touch the root of the matter, for such tithe rent-charge is still rated on almost gross value, and '*under the provisions of an Act which are not suitable to such a property.*' It was the recognition of this fact, partly, which led the last Commission on Local Taxation (whose Report we cannot quote *in extenso*) to state

*'That the present Law, as interpreted by the Courts, works unjustly, and places such owners in a much less favourable position than other owners who are also occupiers of rateable property,' and 'sufficient allowance is not made for the fact that the persons entitled to it are under a legal obligation to render services, and to perform duties in return therefor.'*

Three of the Commissioners (including Sir J. T. Hibbert, whom a leading lawyer described in the House of Commons as being 'one than whom there is no stauncher Liberal, nor one more experienced in matters of this kind') added to the Report, signed as it was by twelve out of fifteen Commissioners, the suggestion to 'allow further deductions from the gross value of tithe rent-charge not severed from a

Benefice.' Nothing of the kind was done by the Rates Relief Act, and it is only along such lines, as we think, that an equitable settlement can be arrived at.

We may summarize the whole position thus: The owner of such tithe rent-charge is regarded and treated as an 'occupier' of tithe, but, as such, he is rated at a 'net annual value' which is practically the gross annual value. Again, although rightly to be regarded as an 'inhabitant,' as has been shewn, he is expressly excluded from the relief granted to other inhabitants under the Personalty Relief Act of 1840. He is rated on his service-value for duties statutorily required of him. In other words, he pays rates on earned income. The claim to be allowed to have deductions for such service is no new one, for we find it made by a rector in 1701: *'In the assessment, a sum should be allowed for our labour, else if we be rated for it, every man that works daily work ought to be rated for it, and every man, by the same reason, ought to be taxed for what is made of his estate by labour.'* The owner of tithe rent-charge attached to a benefice does not ask for exceptional treatment: he claims the mere justice of being set free from exceptional treatment. In whichever of the two categories he be placed, whether of 'occupier' or 'inhabitant,' he claims that he should not be any longer treated differentially from others in either of these two classes of ratepayers.

Transparent as the case seems to us to be, it is still unlikely, as was shewn during the passage of the Rates Relief Act in 1898 through the Houses of Parliament, that it will be allowed to go unchallenged. We must therefore give some consideration to the objections that may be urged. It is asserted that 'the clerical owner of tithe rent-charge has no grievance with regard to the poor rate, inasmuch as the poor were meant to have a share of the tithe'; but the replies to this assertion are that, as so great a lawyer as the late Lord Chancellor Selborne amply proved,<sup>1</sup> *'there is no historical evidence to shew that any such custom, practice or right ever prevailed in any part of England'*; and that the

<sup>1</sup> *Defence of the Church.*



'poor rate' is a complete misnomer: in most cases, if not in all, the other purposes included in this term call for a much larger contribution. We do not think that the average tithe owner would object, however inequitable his mode of assessment might be, to contribute therefrom for the relief of the poor pure and simple. He might be willing to bear in silence his burden. Again, it is said: 'Where is the grievance of the tithe owner, for at the Commutation a sum of money was added to the tithe for the purpose of meeting the rates henceforth to be levied under that Act?' The matter is certainly a complicated one, but there is no sufficient evidence to shew that anything more was done than this:—In the numerous cases where a composition was made in lieu of tithes in kind, previous to that Act, between the owner and the payer (the latter paying the rates, and handing over to the owner the balance), there was added to the value of tithe actually paid to the owner a sum, as determined to be the equivalent to the rates deducted by the tithe payer, so as to bring the whole value up to its proper amount or as near as possible thereto. It is further said that 'the clerical tithe owner is not rated upon his income,' however small that income may be, 'for his income is the tithe rent-charge that is left after the rates have been levied.' We will quote some authoritative statements upon this point. The Lord Chief Justice, in *Cooper v. Blakiston*, said that he

*'Knew perfectly well that the burdens which fell upon the clergymen from the point of view of taxation were very much greater than those which fell upon any other members of the Community in proportion to their income. They had to pay a very large proportion of rates which were really income tax, in respect of their tithes.'*

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 1897, used the following words in the House of Commons: '*The conclusions of the Mover of this Resolution were based on what I may say I feel is a very strong argument, that the Incumbent of the parish being rated on his tithe rent-charge is the only man who is rated on his professional income.*' The *Spectator* in an exhaustive article<sup>1</sup> affirmed that '*the Clergyman whose income was*

<sup>1</sup> July 1, 1899.

derived from tithe rent-charge pays neither more nor less than a local income tax, in the shape of rates.' In 1851 the Earl of Malmesbury called the attention of the House of Lords to this point thus: '*In plain English, the clergyman pays a tax upon his income to the Poor rate.*' And in 1852 Mr. Gladstone said: '*The clergy have a real grievance. It is admitted by all authorities. Professor Jones, Mr. Cornewall Lewis, and every one who has examined the subject of local rating, will tell you that the clergy suffer cruelly by being rated on their gross incomes.*' But it is speciously argued: '*Tithe rent-charge is a property and is not wages.*' In one sense it is '*a property,*' but a property to which are statutably attached certain specific services. It is not a property to which the clergyman is otherwise or absolutely entitled. Still, it is argued, he accepts the benefice with full knowledge of its rateability. Certainly, but this by no means entails the obligation always to endure that which he may feel, at the time of his acceptance of the benefice, in his judgement ought to be cured. Once more, it is said, '*The rate is not a rate upon the person at all, it is a rate upon the property.*' A leading authority upon local rating, however, assures us that '*it is never things but persons who pay rates and taxes, and in early times the metaphor which attributes payment to the thing, in respect of which the person is rated or taxed had not taken possession of the ordinary mind as it has now*'<sup>1</sup>: and the author of *English Land and Landlords* affirms that '*taxes are paid not by property but by persons.*'<sup>2</sup> This theory has been spoken of as '*the monstrous growth of sophistry as to the incidence of taxation,*' and it has been pointed out that

'The essential thing to remember is that the common talk about the land or houses paying rates is a mere slipshod phrase of convenience. In reality no inanimate thing pays rates, it cannot do so, these are always paid by the person, and therefore when we say "the land pays rates" we only mean that the person pays in respect of this.'

<sup>1</sup> Cannan, *History of Rating*.

<sup>2</sup> Brodrick, *English Lands and Landlords*.

In *Rowls v. Gells* (1776) Lord Mansfield, repeating older decisions, said '*The poor's rate is not a tax upon the land but a personal charge in respect of the land.*'

To these objections, made mainly by politicians during the debates in Parliament on the Tithe Rates Relief Act, we must add one more, *viz.* that 'any such relief as proposed by this Bill will be a fresh endowment by the State of the Church.' But this is inaccurate, because we may ask in vain for the production of any statute by which the Church has ever been endowed. The only form of endowment granted by the State to the Church is that which is common to all religious bodies that are registered, *viz.* the freedom of places of worship, exclusively so used, from local rating. Presbyterian ministers in Scotland were, in 1861, relieved from local rates, but this has never been enacted in England. If it be said that such relief as clerical tithe owners claim, equitably they think, would be 'class legislation,' then we assert that if any class of the persons in the body politic suffer any injustice, or have an indefeasible right to benefits, it is the proper business of the legislature to remove those injustices and to confer those benefits, as is being constantly done, and that recently, by such means as 'The Workmen's Compensation Act' and the provision of 'Old Age Pensions.' The claim of the clerical tithe owner is that for long, too long, he has lain under burdens of taxation which are 'unduly onerous,' and that it is equitable that he should be relieved, so far as is practicable, therefrom, not as an act of charity but as an act of common justice. No more fitting words to set before the legislature and the public can be found than those of the distinguished statesman, Sir Robert Peel, who in 1836 addressed the House of Commons thus :

*'Considering that the parties interested are the clergy, who have no direct representatives amongst us, it is required . . . by a proper regard to the protection of the rights and privileges of those persons, that we should not appear to sanction any principle which we are not satisfied is consistent with justice.'*

We put side by side with these words those of Sir Robert Phillimore, who in 1856 said :

*'The tithe rent-charge, which represents the ancient tithe, has, since the Parochial Assessments Act, 1836, been subjected to an excessive amount of rating, notoriously disproportionate to that to which other persons, and in particular the landowner, are subjected.'*

It will be asked, naturally and necessarily, By what means is the money for local purposes to be raised if a large portion of the £100,000 per annum now paid by clerical owners of tithe rent-charge be lost to the community? We reply generally, in the words of Mr. Gladstone, spoken when Sir Robert Phillimore's Bill was under consideration in 1856, that

*'After the universal admission which had been made as to the existence of the grievances, it would not be altogether creditable to allow small difficulties of detail and small differences of opinion to prevent the application of a remedy to them. They ought not to fold their arms and say, "Although the grievance is plain, palpable, and even scandalous, we cannot, on account of difficulties of detail, attempt to provide a remedy."'*

We would further state that clerical tithe owners have never sought to be entirely relieved from rateability in respect of tithe rent-charge, though even if they did so claim and their claim were allowed, that which is a burden when borne by a few persons would be insignificant if thrown upon the community. For example, the rateable value of the writer's tithe rent-charge is 250*l.*, whereas the rateable value of the parish is 12,016*l.*, and the ratepayers in rural districts need to be reminded that ever since 1836 they have been eased at the expense of the incumbent. There are signs on the political horizon that the, as it was then, purely temporary relief of personalty from local taxation in 1840, which has been renewed annually since, ought to be repealed, especially inasmuch as personalty is increasing so largely and rapidly. In 1897-8 there was assessed to income tax 525,211,200*l.* worth of property; ten years later it had increased to 640,048,238*l.* It has been said that *'if people do not complain they have no grievance,'* and by yet another prominent statesman that *'if the lot of the clerical tithe owner is to be ameliorated the persons concerned must unite to protect their interests.'* Union is strength,



and the needful co-operation can be brought about by the majority of the 10,000 tithe-rent-charge-owning clergy joining such associations as 'The Tithe Rent-charge Owners' Union,'<sup>1</sup> which, since its foundation in 1880, has done much useful work, and 'The Incumbents' Fair-rating League,' founded more recently.<sup>2</sup> We have stated the grounds upon which, and the causes by which, this 'unduly onerous burden' has been cast upon the owners of tithe rent-charge attached to a benefice. We verily believe that the appeal to justice and equity, if adequately made, will not be in vain. The main point which needs to be emphasized is that the tithe-owning clergy are contributing to local rates sums far in excess of other citizens. These pay rates, roughly speaking, *on one-tenth of their incomes* (rent representing about that proportion to income), *e.g. on 30l. out of an income of 300l. per annum*; but *the tithe-owning clergy pay in rates at least one-tenth, and in many case far more of their incomes*. The ordinary citizen, with 300l. a year, and living in a house assessed at 30l., would pay at a five-shilling rate 7l. 10s. to local rates, but the clergyman with the same 'gross income,' on the same rate would pay, even with the allowance of the Rates Relief Act, about 30l. to local rates, in addition to the rates on the assessment of the house which he is compelled to live in. The appeal is for justice, which one has said 'is the greatest interest of man on earth.'

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE NOVELS OF MR. HENRY JAMES.

1. *Portrait of a Lady*. By HENRY JAMES. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1881.)
2. *What Maisie knew* and *The Two Magics*. By the same. (London: W. Heinemann. 1887, 1898.)
3. *The Wings of the Dove*. By the same. (London: A. and C. Constable. 1902.)

<sup>1</sup> 56 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.

<sup>2</sup> Hon. Secretary, Rev. R. T. Shea, Little Wakering Vicarage, Southend-on-Sea.

4. *The American Scene*. By the same. (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd. 1907.)
5. *The Ambassadors* and *The Golden Bond*. By the same. (London: Methuen and Co. 1903, 1905.)
6. *The Novels of Henry James*. Definitive Edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1907-9.)

THE appearance of the definitive edition of an author's novels is an invitation to look back over his completed work. In the case of an author so individual, so conscientious as Mr. Henry James there is a particular interest in doing so. One can imagine what it would be like if anyone cared to make up the *compte rendu* for the last quarter of a century of some of our popular writers. In one case it might be the chronicle of half a generation of 'Society' fads—music, metaphysics, stockbroking, salmon-fishing, Christian Science, and the automobile. In another, one might follow the fluctuations of the market which demand in one season the cape and sword romance and in another the problem novel. Mr. James has laboured persistently to disengage his own vision and impression of things, without lowering himself to the tradesman's view of a novelist's functions. He has his reward in the passionate cult of a few, and in the serious attention of those who still respect the vocation of the man of letters.

The artistic sincerity and devotion of Mr. Henry James make more significant the changes that have come upon his work during thirty-five years of authorship. Yet the thread of continuity is strong. It is easy to perceive the difference between *Roderick Hudson* and *The Golden Bowl*; but it is equally apparent that none but the author of the one could have written the other. The subject of the two books is essentially the same, and it is dominant in almost everything that Mr. James has written—the clash between two distinct types of breeding and culture, the contact of the American, for good and evil, with Europe.

The change one notes is rather in the style than in the man. To some extent, as usual, the style is the man. The moral judgements that come so crisp and clear from New

England may have undergone some modifying and qualifying, expressed by a manner more fluent, more complicated. Readers of the older generation, who rejoiced in *Roderick Hudson* and *Daisy Miller* and own themselves beaten by *The Golden Bowl*, may long for the good old days, when Mr. James condescended to tell a story like anybody else. Others think that he has developed just the medium suited to his peculiar talent. For what he is called to do is precisely not to tell a story like anybody else, but to tell that part of the story which no one else ever tells as it should be told. He tells us not so much what his people did as what they felt and thought. He paints them so much from the inside that we only get a glimpse of their outer aspect from their impact on the consciousness of one another. He never describes Kate Croy, but we see what she was like through the charmed helplessness to which she reduces the otherwise adequate young man who is content to be twisted round her slim little finger. He never describes Mrs. Newsome (in *The Ambassadors*), but we are aware all through the story of that pale, austere, distinguished presence—the provincial *précieuse*, with her high narrow conscientiousness, backed by the sense of power to make her rectitude felt, a blend of the Swan of Lichfield and Queen Elizabeth. We see Waymarsh, the Puritan in Paris, as the brilliant Miss Barrace sees him through her long-handled tortoiseshell eyeglass, ‘sitting at his tent door’ and looking out like Abraham with distant tolerance on the children of the land. We see, again, Mamie Pocock, the charming American girl, as Lambert Strether sees her, after he has become accustomed to the type of the French *jeune fille* so exquisitely presented by Jeanne de Vionnet.

‘She was handsome and easy and chatty, soft and sweet, and almost disconcertingly reassuring. She was dressed, if we may so far discriminate, less as a young lady than as an old one, had an old one been supposable by Strether as so committed to vanity; the complexities of her hair missed also the looseness of youth, and she had a mature manner of bending a little as if to encourage and reward, while she held neatly in front of her a pair of strikingly polished hands, the combination of all of

which kept up about her the glamour of her "receiving," placed her again perpetually between the windows and within sound of the ice-cream plates, suggested the enumeration of all the names, all the Mr. Coxes and Mr. Coleses, gregarious specimens of a single type, she was happy to "meet."

It meets the case, this Whistler touch of his, the easy, fluent, almost vaporous manner, which seldom presents you with a definite outline of story or dialogue—all in dim greys or violets, only broken here and there by a bar of black shadow or gleaming light. The atmosphere in which Mr. James works is really an atmosphere of human souls—the thought-life out of which action is generated, in which character melts and dissolves and hardens into new forms.

Out of that fluid mist, that purple vagueness in which he keeps his story, the salient points, the things that matter flash out with extraordinary distinctness, as when the terrible Kate Croy in the *Wings of a Dove* explains to her lover his part in their joint plot against their benefactress: 'You will, in the natural course, have money. We shall, in the natural course, be free.' The very words, clearly and softly articulated by the Borgia woman, flash like drawn knives out of the elusive atmosphere against the delicate tints of the background.

We are led to the conclusion that in forsaking the simplicity of his earlier manner, Mr. James has not yielded to a vice of style, but like a consummate artist has elaborated a medium to suit his matter. One trait in his method, which some readers find irritating and others delightful, is his use of metaphors, to give, as in a picture, the essence of a situation. When Lambert Strether, aware of the impending breach with his best friends, comes upon Mamie alone at the hotel, dimly conscious also herself of estrangement where she had hoped for sympathy, and tacitly disposed to make common cause with him, he feels himself 'stranded with her in a quaint community of shipwreck. Their little interview was like a picnic on a coral strand, they passed each other, with melancholy smiles and looks sufficiently allusive, such cupfuls of water as they had saved.'

Or again, when Mamie's mother, who has been sent over



by Mrs. Newsome when Strether fails to deliver her son from his Parisian siren, finds herself by means of young Newsome's social cleverness entangled in the circle of his acquaintances and actually present with them at a reception in his rooms.

'She affected [Strether] as a person seated in a runaway vehicle and turning over the question of a possible jump. Would she jump—could she—would that be a safe place? His question at such instants sat for him in her lapse into pallor, her tight lips, her conscious eyes. One thing remained well before him . . . that if she should gather in her skirts, close her eyes, and quit the carriage while in motion he would promptly enough become aware. She would alight from her headlong course more or less directly upon him.'

In Mr. James' last novel, as in his early books, we find the New World and the Old in opposition. There are the Americans, there are the Europeans, and there are the Americans who are more or less by way of being Europeanized. It is because he is himself an American who has suffered the Europeanizing process pretty completely and yet retained so unmistakably his national and racial traits, that his treatment of this *motif* is so significant. The case of Mr. Henry James' personages is more or less also the case of Mr. Henry James himself. We remember with what freshness and interest the author invested this subject in *Roderick Hudson*. The setting must have been suggested by the experiences of the many Anglo-Saxons who found Rome so delightful a place of sojourn in the days before 1870, the sculptors, artists, and men of letters from Hawthorne to Browning. In the fascinating collection of letters and reminiscences, published under the title *William Wetmore Story and his Friends*, Mr. James has recalled this period with the tenderness which it always evokes from those who remember it. It was the time which Mr. Marion Crawford, himself a son of the American sculptor who was one of the best-known figures in the circle, paints in the most characteristic and genial of his books—a time when (whatever may be said of it as regards the weightier matters of the law) 'life for the foreign colony had an amenity, a golden charm which it has never attained since.

Picture then the case of the young man who from one of the white-painted, elm-shaded dwellings of a New England village, from the narrow, simple, straight-ruled life with its absence of background and of outlook, of complexity and suggestion, is transported to such a scene and to such society. In Julian Hawthorne's *Life of his father* there is a passage that strikes one as intensely pathetic. It describes how the lady who afterwards married Nathaniel Hawthorne with some other young people of their society used to meet at the house of one of them who had some engravings of classical statues from the Louvre or the Vatican, to study these things, almost to worship them, as all the reflection that was ever likely to come their way of

‘ The glamour that was Greece,  
The glory that was Rome,’

so strong was the hunger for beauty, surviving Puritan rigour, in many humble New England homes. In one of her books Mrs. Beecher Stowe describes such a housewife as she herself might have known, reading eagerly books of travel and art, asking herself, ‘ What was that wonderful music of the *Miserere* ? ’ as she baked her pies.

From a *milieu* like this, Roderick Hudson, beautiful and gifted as a young Goethe, is taken by a benevolent patron. In the ambient air of that warm-toned city by the yellow Tiber he develops rapidly, almost furiously. He produces some remarkable works. He falls in love with all the passionate selfishness of his nature. He disappoints his benefactor and breaks the heart of his mother and of his betrothed.

‘ He never saw himself as a part of a whole but only as a clear-cut, sharp-edged isolated individual, rejoicing or raging as the case might be, but needing in any case absolutely to affirm himself.’

Of Mary Garland his injured *fiancée*, with whom his friend is in love, he remarks to that friend, ‘ She idolizes me, and if she were never to see me again, she would idolize my memory.’ When the true aspect of his behaviour is brought

home to him in a way he cannot evade, all he feels is 'aesthetic disgust at the graceless contour of his conduct.' 'I have been hideous,' he says; and that is all.

Clearly on this no one could suspect the author of suggesting that fine aesthetic sensibilities should be regarded as an acceptable substitute for ordinary morality. The main interest of *Roderick Hudson* is an ethical interest, and it would not be difficult to shew that the ethical interest in one form or another dominates every book that Mr. James has written. As a psychologist *par excellence* he cannot help being a moralist. He never loses that note of New England at its best, 'the note of active virtue as the aim and meaning of life.' But, and here the wider influence comes in, he learns to insist that this moral distinction 'only shines without a shadow when people's tempers are easy if their morality is not.' A deep appreciation of the importance of manner, the value of amenity, the supremacy of kindness, the need of cultivating those qualities that make, not so much for the rigour of the individual code, as for the happy living together of men in society, develops in him. He demands with Coventry Patmore that virtue 'should not only be but seem'—that it should forswear pedantry and pose and angularity. 'People who from the moment they are not delighted can only be unpleasant' are to his mind wanting in one essential of virtue.

In *The American* we are shewn an embodiment of New England will and conscience face to face with the traditions of an ancient social order. Mr. James is not kind, here or elsewhere, in some of his representations of that social order. They shew it horribly false, tyrannical, cruel. Gilbert Osmond, in the *Portrait of a Lady*, who so deludes the frank, sweet, spontaneous Isabel, belongs to it. He and Madam Merle, with all her finish and fascination, are products of corruption, creatures of an unclean tradition. Once or twice is clearly heard the note of the Puritan conscience protesting against a cult of *bibelots* that starves the sense of human justice and kindness. Osmond has a 'fine mind' in relation to curtains and china. As regards more important matters, he is capable of abysmal baseness and greed.

His poor little daughter, Pansy, in spite of Isabel's efforts to befriend her, is crossed in her innocent first love, and sent to a convent to be gently moulded to the paternal wishes, in accordance with another tradition for which Mr. James has no tenderness. In contrast to all this refined decadence, we have the breezy figure of the round-eyed newspaper correspondent, the newest of New World types.

But in *The Europeans* the problem is presented from another side. We see the eminently respectable exponents of New England at its best—'the note of active virtue as the aim and meaning of life'—face to face with a conception of life which can also claim to be a kind of virtue—the tradition of amenity, of happy amiability, represented by the cosmopolitan Felix. At the same time the country-town outlook is broadened by the advent of the countess and all that she represents. There is a sense of escape, of the throwing down of barriers, the opening of windows to unimagined horizons. The emancipation of Gertrude may be taken to balance the disenchantment of Isabel.

*Daisy Miller*, which appeared in 1878, was probably the book which did most to make Mr. James' name familiar to the general public. He created a type, the type of the young American girl, which has dominated the continental imagination. The American girl was not to the same extent a portent in England, which has never altogether given in to the semi-Orientalism of Latin ideas about women, and in London Daisy Miller, though she would have been reckoned a badly-brought-up little girl, would not have met with her tragic misconstruction. But one need not pursue very far one's researches into modern French fiction to find the '*Daisy Miller* misunderstanding' repeated. M. Bourget, for instance, in *Profils Perdus* has a sketch of an English maiden which would probably be incomprehensible to the subject of it. M. Hermant in *Les Grands Bourgeois* has shewn himself equally incapable of understanding the Anglo-Saxon young woman. M. Marcel Prevost, when accused (with what justice it is not for a foreigner to say) of libelling his young country-women in *Les Demi-Vierges*, excused himself by saying that, after all, the disease he



diagnosed was a foreign importation. 'Le Flirt' was Anglo-Saxon! Even in Elizabeth's time, we are told, the frank familiarity of the manners of English ladies laid them open to the suspicion of their continental visitors. *Daisy Miller* is an American who refused to be Europeanized. Be it stupidity or pride, she remains what she is—she declines to bend, to accept the local convention, to do as Rome does. In her crude touching prettiness, her poor forlorn obstinacy, she contrasts strangely with the splendid sorceresses of Mr. James' later manner.

In more senses than one *The Bostonians* marks an epoch. It was the last of Mr. James' 'pleasant' books, the last that could be called easy reading. It was also the last of which the scene was laid in America. Some of our author's ardent admirers have given to this work a special place in their hearts. He has left out of it for the time being both the beauty and the moral miasma of the Old World. The virtues as well as the vices of the personages are marked with the Stars and Stripes. At the same time the book could hardly have been written except by one penetrated with a sense of the differing social conditions of Europe. Only a keen perception of the place given to women by an older civilization could make so clear-cut the differentiation of the American idea—the asexual type of the dried-up little doctor, who cares for nothing but her work and her fishing; the jealous exclusive affection of Olive for Verena, and the feminist fanaticism which is nothing but the expression of a passionate nature denied its normal outlet. The two shabby quacks who are the father and mother of the charming Verena, and exploit the beautiful guileless girl at thought-reading *séances*, are American too; and most characteristic of all is the old Abolitionist, the queer, shabby, soft-hearted, ridiculous, heroic, little old maid, who spends her substance and her life for the sake of the 'Cause.' Nothing in all Mr. James' books is more sympathetic, more morally refreshing than his picture of this preposterous old saint of the anti-slavery struggle. The episode of her gradual painless extinction is finely contrasted with the tumult in Verena's mind at the crisis of her fate. Olive wishes Verena to

devote herself to friendship and Women's Suffrage, Ransome calls her to a life of love and poverty. The girl's gratitude and generosity would lead her to submit to her patroness, but her heart is with her lover, and while the battle is raging within her the old Abolitionist passes away, as a boat in the soft splendour of the dying day sails out into the sunset and disappears. The *dénouement* is logically consistent. You feel that Verena, being what she is, would never have made up her own mind. Her lover rushes in and carries her off just as she is about to mount the platform at a Suffrage meeting. It is an indication of the author's imperfect sympathy with one form of American development that he does not make us as sorry for Olive as we ought in fairness to be.

*What Maisie Knew* jarred on the feelings of many simple people to whom the lovely innocence of a child in contact with an equivocal situation is too painful a thing for the prolonged study which the writer, with a sort of perversity, gave it. Was it to shew that he could 'go one better,' could give another 'turn to the screw,' that Mr. James wrote the gruesome little story of the Seen and Unseen which stands first in the volume called *The Two Magics*? The impression is for once as simple and as strong as in a witch story of Stevenson's: the haunting moral horror is the same, and once more we feel that the New England Puritan and the Scottish Calvinist are kin. The belief in the corruption of man's heart—sin as the grim old Calvinists taught perverting the fairest and sweetest—emerges here in a manner rather disconcerting to those who have been deluded by the bland aesthetic atmosphere of Mr. James' other tales. Here again he shews himself to be of the true spiritual family of Hawthorne. But the note of moral discord is heard all through this curious book as it is heard through *Transformation*, where the fascination of the South, of luxury and passion, of the *joie de vivre*, are at war with the ascetic Puritan impulse; they are never completely fused.

Mr. Henry James is much less *farouche* than Hawthorne: he is more tamed, more Europeanized; yet now and then one

sees aloof the grim ancestral Puritan, watching, judging. Even where he paints the allurements of the world most complacently there is the detachment of a tacit judgement; and the *crux* of each of his later books is precisely a moral choice. Yet he chooses of set purpose the richest background he can for these dramas. The millionaire looms very large in the later stories. One fancies that the writer has steeped himself in the air of the Renaissance. The *dramatis personae* of *The Wings of the Dove* or *The Golden Bowl* are just as much removed as the Renaissance heroes from common limitations—princes by their wealth as those others were by their birth. About them are grouped adventurers and adventuresses of the same order, colossal in greed, pride, and audacity, women who might be sisters to Borgia, young men as hot in passion and as little troubled with scruples as the lovers of Bianca Capelli or Vittoria Accoramboni.

The plot of *The Wings of the Dove* is of a striking and horrible simplicity, so simple and so horrible that at least one reviewer took refuge in the author's reputation for difficulty, and declared that as the story could not mean what it seemed to mean, it was impossible to tell what it did mean. The 'Dove' is of course the enormously wealthy American girl, whom Mr. James according to his manner depicts by shewing the reflection of her in the mind of those who came into contact with her. What impresses the people who surround her—greedy, impecunious noblemen, pushing women in Bayswater, poor girls fighting for their own hand against the world—is the huge power concentrated in those little feeble hands. What is notable for them in the frail, strange-looking girl is her fabulously expensive mourning, the yards of priceless lace swathed round her delicate throat, her ropes of pearls and all that these things stand for. To the generous, rather foolish little authoress who comes with her from America, she is an infinitely pathetic creature, with a kingdom at her feet that she is condemned to die and leave. And as to the young man on whom this strange, sad, charming creature—this Maeterlinck princess—has cast her eyes, it is the growth of pity, reverence, and remorse

in him that fairly finish and stamp the portrait in one's mind.

By the same method of reflection we learn to know the foil to Milly, Kate Croy, perhaps the worst of all Mr. James' extensive gallery of bad women, and yet in a sense human and pardonable. It is with a view of her own possible moral declension, with an impulse that might have saved her, that she offers to her wretched father to flout the rich aunt in Bayswater and accept a life of poverty. It is this hopeless father and her silly sister who rob her of her chance of saving her soul. She settles down to a fat, luxurious life, in which the constant struggle to climb a step on the social ladder is the only stimulus. The girl who once had it in her to face poverty with her lover, accepting the wealth-worship that goes on around her, soon 'better the instruction.' She dominates and enslaves Densham till she has made him her instrument in the callous plot against her friend. He is to feign affection for the dying heiress, to marry her, to inherit her fortune. "You will, in the natural course, have money. We shall, in the natural course, be free." Like a Bianca di Capelli, she sticks at nothing to besot and bewilder her instrument. All the more of a shock is it to her when the tool breaks in her hands. In the last scene of the book, the memory of the dead girl stands between the two criminals. He refuses to touch the fortune which has come to him through the generous forgiveness of her whom his treachery has slain. "You are in love with her memory," Kate tells him, and leaves him to that memory with the words, "We shall never be as we were."

Here, distinctly, whatever interest the author may feel for his splendid sinners, he is on the side of the angels. Still more so in *The Golden Bowl* when little Maggie, the American bride of the conscienceless, charming Italian prince, routs and banishes the conspirator against her domestic happiness. But if anyone suspects Mr. James of a tame acquiescence in the Philistine view of things, he has only to take up *The Ambassadors*.

Lambert Strether is sent over by Mrs. Newsome, the great



lady of Woollet, Massachusetts, and the proprietress of a 'concern' regarding which we are only allowed to know that it offers, as Dr. Johnson said of Thrane's Brewery, 'the potentialities of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice,' to detach the son of the house, residing in Paris, from a supposed entanglement with Comtesse de Vionnet, and to send him back to these 'potentialities.' Strether is an elderly literary man of a type that business America has very little use for. The literary and social interests of America are so much in the hands of women that it is naturally Mrs. Newsome who makes his chance in Woollet, such as it is. He carries on a course of foreign literature under her patronage; he edits a Review which she supports. She appreciates him, one gathers, to the point of being prepared to make him Prince Consort of Woollet; and it is in the capacity of an intimate friend of the family that he takes up his embassy. Hardly any of Mr. James' characters is more interesting or attaching than the curious figure of this American gentleman, who contrives to be quixotically dignified and independent in a position that might be expected to give little room for the display of these qualities. If he is all along 'put through' by one woman or another, one feels that it is because (in spite of the old saw that 'women love a rake') the thing that most surely attaches and subjects them is a certain guilelessness and unworldliness.

Strether finds the selfish cub he had known transformed immensely to his advantage, and is completely carried away by his admiration for the lady who had worked the marvellous change. He declines to believe any evil of a person or a connexion which has had such happy results. He naïvely communicates his impressions to his patroness at Woollet, and infuriates her there by insisting that Chad has 'duties' to the woman who has sacrificed the best years of her life to him, which he has not the right to throw over for the sake of the 'potentialities' represented by Woollet. He may be bewildered, as he is certainly under the charm; but he is obviously honestly and pathetically disinterested. 'His only logic,' as he says to his best friend, is 'not out of the whole affair to have got anything for himself.'

The point that is made by the position of a man like Strether in Woollet is emphasized by the figure of Jim Pocock, the successful business man, who comes out to Paris with the other 'Ambassador,' his wife and Mrs. Newsome's daughter. Jim, with his commonness, his narrowness, his obvious inferiority to his womenkind from the social point of view, represents the type, according to Mr. James, of most American husbands and fathers—mere accumulators of money for the women to spend. This tendency of women to engross all aspects of life that are not simply material, or rather of men to leave them to the women, is not known, as he rightly says, anywhere in Europe.

In *The American Scene* Mr. James repeats the criticism of *The Ambassadors*. Himself the heir of the old-time New England culture, he finds in the newer American little but 'the triumph of the superficial, the apotheosis of the raw.' Except to some extent in Washington, he finds nothing which in older societies 'supplies the element of custom and perpetuity to the massive private ease' which in America is unrelated. In the absence of 'a Visible Church, a Visible State, a visible society, a visible past,' the lavish luxury of the millionaire is 'a purple patch without a possible contrast,' a discord as grating as the already noted failure of the two sexes 'to keep step socially.' The American world seems organized to gainsay the golden truth that 'production takes time and the production of interest takes most time,' and he asks it, in a sort of desperation, 'What in the name of all its possessions and all its destitutions, it would honestly be at?'

There is small doubt at any rate what Mr. Henry James would be at, and if in this last book he has seemed a little hard on his own people, he has done enough in other ways to shew how valuable an element in the world-comity is the typical American, of whom he has given us more than one example, whom European life has not dazzled or intoxicated but ripened, disengaging his peculiar quality and adding amenity and tolerance to 'the note of active virtue as the aim and meaning of life.'

ART. IX.—POPE GREGORY VII AND THE  
HILDEBRANDINE IDEAL.

1. *Monumenta Gregoriana: (Registrum: Epistolae Collectae: Bonithonis Liber ad amicum).* Edidit P. JAFFÉ. 'Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum.' Tom. II. (Berolini. 1865.)
  2. Watterich: *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae.* Tom. I. A.D. 872-1099. (Lipsiae. 1862.)
  3. *Libelli de lite Imperatorum et Pontificum saeculis XI et XII conscripti.* Tom. I-III. 'Monumenta Germaniae Historica.' (Hannoverae. 1891-7.)
  4. *Lamperti Monachi Hersfeldensis Opera.* Recognovit O. Holder-Egger. 'Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum.' (Hannoverae et Lipsiae. 1894.)
  5. *Quellen zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites.* Heft I. Von E. BERNHEIM. (Leipzig und Berlin. 1907.)
  6. *Gregor VII, Sein Leben und Wirken.* Bände I-II. Von W. MARTENS. (Leipzig. 1894.)
  7. *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV und V.* Bände I-IV. Von G. MEYER VON KNONAU. (Leipzig. 1890-1903.)
  8. *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands.* B. III. Von A. HAUCK. (Leipzig. 1906.)
  9. *La Querelle des Investitures dans les diocèses de Liege et de Cambrai.* Première Partie: *Les Réformes Gregorienes,* etc. Par A. CAUCHIE. (Louvain. 1890.)
  10. *Der Begriff der Investur in den Quellen und der Literatur des Investiturstreites.* ('Kirchenrechtlichen Abhandlungen': 56.) Von ANTON SCHARNAGL. (Stuttgart. 1908.)
- And other Works.

IN the eleventh century the long disorder which had followed the barbarian invasions began to crystallize into the mediaeval system. We can see the beginnings of the modern kingdoms, and of modern constitutions, and these beginnings are mainly due to rulers who made the best of the material to hand, slowly consolidating dominions and territories, governing both themselves and others by

precedents and obligations, practical workmen of the day rather than theorists with an ideal. William the Conqueror, just and stern although aggressive and grasping, tenacious of his rights but mindful of his obligations, is a good type of his day, a day of great workmen rather than of great idealists. And yet, although it was an age of seeming disorder, new ideas were growing into shape and the foundations of new institutions were being laid. The edifice of Feudalism was being wrought out and Feudalism was, as Professor Maitland has taught us, 'a natural and even a necessary stage in our history.'<sup>1</sup> 'The process that is started when barbarism is brought into contact with civilization is not simple.' Before the eleventh century the Western Church had gone through that process, and in the Reformation which groups itself around Hildebrand we see the attempt to trace once more lines that had been formerly 'traced with precision and had then been smudged out.' The Papacy of Gregory VII was a necessary stage in the process by which the Western Church, affecting the barbarian races and affected by them, passed into the Church of more modern days.

Among the institutions which most deeply influenced the barbarian races on their entry into the Roman Empire was the episcopate. But as we pass from the fourth to the eleventh century the type of the episcopate is altogether changed. To begin with, the bishop is really a missionary

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Maitland's *Domesday Book and Beyond*, pp. 223-225, where he speaks of the disorder and retrogression in Western Europe from the fourth century to the tenth; he is dealing with legal ideas: 'ideal possessions which have been won for mankind by the thought of Roman lawyers are lost for a long while and must be recovered painfully . . . in the beginning all was very vague, and such clearness and precision as legal thought has attained in the days of the Norman Conquest has been very gradually attained, and is chiefly due to the influence which the old heathen world working through the Roman Church has exercised upon the new.' It is in this light that we have been taught of late to regard the centuries between the fourth and the eleventh: the lesson has been learnt for civil and political matters; it has not yet been applied, as it ought to be, to ecclesiastical.



bishop working inside a given area and with powers almost unlimited in his special work ; all church goods belonged to him—a fact which has its influence upon later church law—and they were inalienable. The clergy worked under him, and had little or no rights against him: the lesser churches were usually mere ‘ stations ’ of the episcopal or mother church, and in such a state of things there was no system of law to speak of ; the bishop supplied all needs. Rights and laws grow up where interests meet and clash, whereas here the bishop stood really alone.

But the entry of the German races changes this. The sense of proprietorship was strong among the Teutonic peoples, and the new rulers and great men soon began to feel their proprietorship in the churches they had either founded or supported. And the new semi-proprietorship in this ‘ Eigenkirche ’ (or ‘ private church ’) came into conflict with the old rights of the bishop. But although the new lord can sell or bequeath the church, its property is still inalienable : it cannot be turned to secular uses ; everything was grouped around the altar, and the conception of the church, with its sacred mission and officers, with its worldly and economic side, was made up of many different elements upon which a varying stress might at different times be laid. The lord begins to appoint the priest who is to serve the altar, and thus trenches upon the bishop’s control over the clergy, the only control known to earlier times. The ‘ Eigenkirche ’ arises out of the same Germanic idea which in other fields has given us landlordship and the modern State.

The intrusion of this new idea led to a long struggle, which makes itself seen in the early Frankish ecclesiastical legislation.<sup>1</sup> Thus, *e.g.* at the Council of Châlons on Saone

<sup>1</sup> Some details of this legislation are given in Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, notes p. 201, and p. 203, and *Growth of Church Institutions*, chap. III. The best account of the ‘ Eigenkirche ’ in ecclesiastical history is to be found in Stutz, *Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterlich-germanischer Kirchenrechtes* (Berlin, 1895), to which the writer is much indebted. See also Werminghoff, *Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im Mittelalter*, I. 83–87.

(A.D. 650) there is a complaint that the lords withdraw from the bishops the property of the church, and that clerks are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the archdeacon.

With the loss of the bishop's central power a time of anarchy set in. The interests of the king were divided: as a great Christian, and as one who sought unity in a disordered land, he favoured the bishops and the old ideal; but he was a great landowner, too, with his private interests to consider. It became necessary to safeguard the churches and their ministers. A new system of church law grew up amid this conflict of interests, and this system was based partly upon the old church law, simply episcopal as it was, and partly upon a recognition of the altered circumstances. A new building up of the diocesan system began, but there were influences at work which, if left unchecked, might have made it strangely unlike the older type of diocese.

With the conception of churches as the property of lords—who appointed their priests, subject (where it could be asserted) to the veto of the bishop, and strove for the right to remove them, which bishops could not always check—with this conception a deeply rooted secularization set in, which was intensified by the anarchy of ecclesiastical rule. Just before the eleventh century began a preacher,<sup>1</sup> probably Gerbert (Silvester II), said that if he were to ask a bishop questions as to his preferments, the reply would probably be that he had given the archbishop 100 shillings for his consecration, but that he did not fear loss: he would receive in his turn gold for ordaining a priest and silver for ordaining a deacon. 'Simon Magus possessed the Church,' but simony was not a mere accident: it sprang from the general secularization of the Church, which was bound up with the Germanic ideas of property.

In France especially simony was rife: Philip I (1060–1108) dismissed one candidate for a see because his power to pay was below that of a rival, but he gave him words of cheer: 'Let me make my profit out of him: then you try

<sup>1</sup> The passage is quoted by Saltet (to whom the writer owes the reference), *Les Réordinations*, pp. 176 and 178, from the *Sermo de informatione episcoporum*, in Migne, *P.L.* t. cxxxix. col. 174.

to have him degraded for simony, after which we can see about satisfying you.' It was a recognized thing—although against laws divine and ecclesiastical—that spiritual offices should be sold: a tainted bishop infected his diocese; bishops lived as barons, and sometimes as bad barons at that; when clerical marriage was common bishops and priests tried to hand on their offices to their sons or families. And so in many varied ways the disease spread; the Church seemed about to lose its power, because it was losing the spirit by which it should live.

In Germany this deeply rooted secularization of the Church had not borne such evil fruit because the emperors had so often been really religious men and had chosen worthy bishops. Thus, although under the Ottos (936–1002) the bishops were made political princes able to counterbalance the dangerous tribal dukes, little harm resulted from what was a real anomaly. But the very phrase used by the king to the chosen bishop, '*accipe ecclesiam*,'<sup>1</sup> was open to misunderstanding, the more so as from the ninth century onwards the king gave the staff also. Everything encouraged the idea that the bishop was mainly for political purposes and was, above everything else, a nominee of the Crown. In the hands of a bad king, or even of a king not governed by a regard for religion, the dangerous custom was certain to become an abuse. The reign of Conrad II (1024–1039), when the royal power was used with less care for the Church's welfare, gave a foretaste of what might happen. At a time when there were few forces making for order, when it was easy to break laws with impunity, the Church was not only troubled with disorders of its own, but was further afflicted by the State.

But the Church has always been a householder knowing to bring out of its treasures things new and old, and amid its worst disorders a movement for reform began. It is

<sup>1</sup> See Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, III. pp. 52–69. For the appointments in France see Imbart de la Tour, *Les Elections Épiscopales dans l'Église de France du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1891), especially p. 74 sq., and many recent dissertations for Germany.

needless to speak of the degradation of the Papacy when it was the sport of shameless women and evil men. The depth seemed reached under the vicious boy, Benedict IX (1033)—once driven into exile by the citizens when John, Bishop of Sabina was irregularly elected as Silvester III, and again superseded by his own act in selling his office to John Gratian (Gregory VI, a real advocate of reform, even if it seemed only to be reached through simony). There could be no question as to the sad state of Rome, even if we make for it the excuse given by a writer some forty years later—that the unhealthy Roman climate prevented strangers coming there to teach, and the poverty of Roman citizens prevented them from travelling abroad to learn. A city, where the few inhabitants were almost lost among the ruins of the past, and where great traditions were made ineffective by robbers outside and turbulence within—such a city was not a likely centre for reform, and the tide of reform had therefore to rise high before it affected the Papacy.

But reform came, and it came from Germany. The great ruler Henry III came to restore order to the Church: he was a great king, and earnestly religious; he had already furthered reform throughout his realm, he had tried to put down simony and to raise the level of clerical life. He now dealt with the three rival Popes: when they were removed, Suidger of Bamberg—that imposing cathedral which Emperor and Pope had joined to found some thirty years before—became Pope as Clement II, and through the Emperor's influence, we may say indeed on his nomination, a line of reforming and German Popes had begun. St. Peter was converted, and it was now for him to strengthen his brethren.

Of the displaced Popes, Gregory VI—described by Bonitho as 'idiota et mirae simplicitatis vir'—alone interests us further. He passed into exile in Germany and died at Cologne (1048); he was accompanied into exile by Hildebrand, then quite young and certainly not beyond minor orders. Some years later Hildebrand spoke of this journey as taken unwillingly, and it was no doubt taken in obedience to command. In Germany, and especially in



Cologne, he came into touch with movements other than those which had so far influenced his youth.

He was born one of the people at Saono (near Bolsena), but of his family we know little: it is unnecessary to discuss here the Jewish descent which has been lately suggested for him.<sup>1</sup> He was certainly, however, brought up at Rome, nourished, as he says, from childhood by St. Peter<sup>2</sup>; an uncle of his was Abbot of the monastery of St. Mary on the Aventine (now the Priory of the Knights of Malta, famous for its memories of Otto III and for its lovely outlook, but spoilt by the unsympathetic treatment usual in Rome), a centre for distinguished visitors and foreign ecclesiastics. But the tendency to magnify his earlier years disregarded historic limits, and the Abbot of Clugny, who was said to have seen a halo upon his youthful brow, had unhappily died before Hildebrand can have been born. Yet in any case the new ideals which were dawning upon the Church must have impressed the young scholar no less than did the tragic degradation of Rome itself.

The great reforming movement which had begun at Clugny in Burgundy was one of the many great revivals of the monastic ideal. Asceticism only gains a greater strength and intensity from the sight of glaring evils in the world outside, and the movement found many friends even beyond the Clugniac circle itself. But we should avoid the tendency to derive great movements solely from local centres or individual leaders; more modern movements such as the Evangelical Revival or the Oxford Movement have suffered through the same mistake. And we should not forget that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tangl, *Gregor VII jüdischer Herkunft?* ('Neues Archiv,' 31, pp. 159-179).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Mon. Gregoriana*, Reg. I. 39, 'amore apostolorum principis, qui me ab infantia mea sub alis suis singulari quadam pietate nutrit et in gremio suae clementiae fovit.' Also III. 10 a (addressed to St. Peter), 'audi me servum tuum, quem ab infantia nutristi et usque ad hunc diem de manu iniquorum liberasti': similarly in VII. 23. Also he speaks of comrades of his in youth: Ingelrannus, 'qui diu nobiscum in sacro palatio mansit' (IV. 11); and Cencius and Albericus, 'ab ipsa paene adolescentia in Romae palatio nutriti' (III. 21). The palatium probably means the Lateran.

alongside of the Clugniacs there were working the leaders of the great Burgundian revival which did so much for piety throughout the Middle Kingdom and deeply influenced our own England by its institution of secular canons. Nor was this all: elsewhere there were like local movements which arose independently of Clugny, although they shared in its ideals. But the common tendency to derive all such results from a common centre has led to their independence being overlooked, while the influence of Clugny has been exaggerated.

This can be seen in the early life of Hildebrand. Clugny was so famous and its influence so widespread that the great Pope has been claimed for one of its followers, and his later activity ascribed to its inspiration. It is true that Bonitho, Bishop of Sutri under Gregory VII, speaks of his hero (for such Gregory really is) going to Clugny after the death of Gregory VI and there becoming a monk. But Bonitho often shews himself to be reckless or ill-informed. No visit to Clugny is needed to explain Hildebrand's reforming zeal: his German sojourn explains that and also his regard for canon law. But of a visit to Clugny there is no mention that commands belief,<sup>1</sup> and indeed Gregory's letters to Abbot Hugo shew no signs of any close relation to the monastery. It is true that he tells us of his anxiety to lead the monastic life, and it was with reluctance that he obeyed the repeated calls to the busy world. But there were places other than Clugny<sup>2</sup> where the monastic life could be learned, and many bishops in Germany were introducing stricter types of it into their dioceses. While there is little evidence for a visit to Clugny before he went there as legate in 1053, it is certain that he was at Cologne with his patron the exiled Gregory VI, and at Cologne and near it were to be found

<sup>1</sup> The 'Clugny fable' is dealt with by Martens, II. pp. 281-5, although the writer cannot accept his explanation of Bonitho's mistake. But see Tangl, *op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> The Clugny story grew until Otto of Freising in the twelfth century makes him Prior of Clugny—a story which is repeated by quite modern writers.

examples of reformed monastic life. Of this city, moreover, Gregory speaks with affection.<sup>1</sup> It was there he had learned 'discipline,' and for the sake of that memory he upheld the honour of Cologne against that of Trier, even so far as to anger Leo IX.

But there was in Germany a further movement under the power of which Hildebrand must have fallen. The eleventh century was a time in which the force of law was being freshly appealed to; the Roman law was studied anew, and its principles proved fruitful of result.<sup>2</sup> At Ravenna a school of jurists arose who did much to support Henry IV in his controversy with Gregory VII: at Bologna the great Countess Matilda, Gregory's devoted supporter, called into being a legal school to counteract Ravenna. But there were legal survivals with a more continuous history, although, as Prof. Vinogradoff says,<sup>3</sup> they are, 'as a rule, hopelessly mixed up with the attempt of the Early Middle Ages to effect a kind of salvage of the general learning of antiquity.' And this legal learning survived, 'more especially through the agency of the learned classes of those days—the clerical and monastic orders.' And thus we have one abstract of Roman laws made in the ninth century, the *Lex Romana canonice compta*, made primarily for the service of ecclesiastics. But apart from Roman law ecclesiastics were now forming a code of their own. In the eleventh century the canon law gained greater power, and in Germany, above all, schools of canon law began.

In face of the general disorder the Church felt the need

<sup>1</sup> *Reg.* I. 79, 'ob recordationem disciplinae, qua tempore antecessoris vestri [writing to Anno of Cologne] in ecclesia Coloniensi enutriti sumus, specialem sibi inter ceteras occidentales ecclesias dilectionem impendimus, et sicut adhuc Romanae ecclesiae filii testantur, tempore beati Leonis papae Treverensi episcopo pro honore ecclesiae vestrae, quod isdem beatus Leo aegre tulit, viribus totis restitimus.'

<sup>2</sup> This process of revival has lately been sketched with power and discrimination by Prof. Vinogradoff in his *Roman Law in Mediaeval Europe* (Harper Brothers, 1909).

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 27.

of an appeal to more primitive times, and also of a more stringent discipline. Much the same need had been felt in the ninth century; and in the appeal to primitive episcopal power there had been found a defence against the growing tyranny of metropolitans and the growing licence of the lower clergy. It was the wish to gain this defence which had led to the forgery of the False Decretals,<sup>1</sup> or the Decretals of Isidore (847-852). From our point of view the main feature of interest is the tendency to lay down fixed principles of organization, and then appeal to them. The collection was probably known to Nicholas I (858-867), but had probably not much influence upon the papal policy until the days of Hildebrand himself.<sup>2</sup>

In these Decretals—a clever mixture of genuine passages with forgeries—an appeal was made against the immediate tyranny of kings and metropolitans to the Primacy of St. Peter, to the jurisdiction of the Papacy as a Court of Appeal. At the same time the incorporation into the Decretals of some earlier forgeries, such as the Donation of Constantine, by which Constantine was supposed to give to Silvester I and his successors the Palace of the Lateran, with the sovereignty of Rome and the provinces of Italy and the West, gave these older documents a wider circulation. Thus they became the foundation of the Pope's temporal dominion, as the Decretals did of his jurisdiction. The whole collection combined with tendencies of the day, not indeed to create, but to strengthen the mediaeval Papacy.

The Decretals slowly worked their way as accepted parts of the constitution of the Church and its law. Thus

<sup>1</sup> Following the opinion more lately supported by Fournier, *Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales* (Louvain, 1907), a reprint of articles in *La Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, the origin of this collection may be most probably placed in the diocese of Tours, not of Mainz or of Rheims.

<sup>2</sup> For this view see Fournier, *op. cit.* chap. v, and on the influence of the False Decretals upon episcopal elections, see Imbart de la Tour, *Les Élections Épiscopales dans l'Eglise de France du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, livre i. c. 10.



they made the Papacy a centre of law and order, such as was found for civil states in the growing power of local kings. In the lifetime of Hildebrand these new legal studies were widely carried on in Germany, and specially carried on by the leaders of Church reform. Thus, for instance, Burchard, Bishop of Worms (1000-1025) had made an adapted collection of Church law which had great influence.<sup>1</sup> He treated the Church as an independent corporation: the Papacy is the Court of highest appeal, and yet the rights of the Crown, as recognized by custom, were recognized. Two contradictory systems lay, as it were, in solution in his *Decretum* or *Collectarium*.

This school of German canonists continued, and Wazo, Bishop of Liège (1042-1048) was a worthy member of it; he it was who advised Henry III on the death of Clement II to restore Gregory VI to the Papacy, on the ground that no one had a right to displace a Pope,<sup>2</sup> subject as Popes were to the Divine judgement only. This advice illustrates the place given to the Pope in the definite system of the German lawyers. And these were the men who were also leaders in the much needed reformation of clerical life. Respect for canon law brought with it a new respect for Church councils and synods; a new activity, a fresh vigour of corporate life began. The consciousness of the Church as a great society, with its past traditions and living power, was peculiarly vivid in Germany, and became a leading feature of the German Reformation of the Papacy.

The pontificate of Leo IX (1049-1056), who as Bruno, Bishop of Toul had been a military leader as well as a

<sup>1</sup> See Koeniger, *Burchard I von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit*, pp. 12-18, and *passim*. It is enough to say that all the elements of the later struggle against the State and the lay power are to be found in solution here, although he, like the great Clugniacs, had no hostility to the State as such. See also Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, III. p. 437 sq.

<sup>2</sup> See Wazo's *Sententia de Gregorio VI Pontifice*, in Watterich, *Vitae Pontificum*, I. 79: '*Summum pontificem a nemine nisi a solo Deo diiudicari debere.*' Stephen IX had been a canon of Liège.

reforming prelate and a yearly pilgrim to the seat of St. Peter, was specially marked by the holding of councils—at Rheims, Mainz, and at Rome itself; at Vercelli and Mantua he shewed the Western Church legislating under the presidency of the Pope. So papal power, canon law, and the feeling of unity grew together as parts of a many-sided growth. They had grown largely before the pontificate of Gregory VII, under whom we first find the False Decretals quoted as oecumenical, and in Germany the future Pope had every chance of being influenced by the movement which gave them currency. The acceptance of this very definite scheme of organization gave an easy and effective remedy against the worst evils of the day. But it brought its own difficulties along with it, and above all in relation to the civil power. Emperor after emperor had been a faithful son of the Church, obedient to its precepts and eager for its growth. Bishoprics, monasteries, and churches had been founded and endowed by the Crown, and it had become the natural thing for kings to use bishops as helpers in the contest against decentralizing forces. Thus the appointment of bishops was of the greatest importance. The primitive practice of election by clergy and laity had gradually fallen into disuse, although interesting survivals of it were left.<sup>1</sup> There was often, however, consultation between the chapter (with the leading laymen of the diocese) and the king, and there was, of course, always the consecration by the provincial bishops. But the decisive weight lay with the king, whose investiture of the chosen priest with ring and staff was the chief ceremony of the appointment. Thus the king by word and act gave more than the mere estate and temporal goods, and the consecration followed his choice as a matter of

<sup>1</sup> The process is admirably sketched for France in the work of Imbart de la Tour, already quoted, *Les Elections Episcopales*. For Germany, Werminghoff, *Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im Mittelalter*, p. 68 sq. Also Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte*, III. p. 97 sq. For England we know too little of episcopal appointments before the Norman Conquest, but see Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I. p. 235 sq. and p. 243 sq.

course. Writers of various views, such as Cardinal Humbert and St. Peter Damiani, insist that what the king was made to give was really the sacramental grace of the office, which was, when plainly stated, an abuse easy to see. The Middle Ages, it is true, drew distinctions that seem to us strange, as when Ordericus Vitalis speaks of a French bishop and baron who, while preserving the strictest celibacy as a bishop, was married in his capacity of baron with a property to hand down. But as yet the Middle Ages did not draw the distinctions we are so apt to make between the spiritual functions and the property which was grouped around them. The State with its interests stood face to face with the Church and its responsibilities, and the point where they met, the junction where the spark would pass, was the cathedral, which like the parish church tended to become a private property instead of a spiritual charge.

The action of the Emperor Henry III in undertaking the reform of the Papacy had raised this conflict with regard to the Papacy itself. Hitherto the Roman clergy and populace had always had the greatest share in the election of their bishop, while the exact share of the Emperor or Patrician is difficult to determine.<sup>1</sup> But the Popes, from Clement II up to Leo IX, were really nominated by Henry III, and it is significant that when Leo was offered the Papacy he refused it, according to the well-known story, unless he were canonically selected by the Romans: he went to Rome as a pilgrim—it was now and with him that Hildebrand returned, all unwillingly, as he says—and only when so elected did he consider himself Pope-elect. The story is significant as shewing the strong hold that the idea of canonical election was taking upon the German ecclesiastics.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The whole question of the Patriciate is a most difficult one: how far the Emperor exercised rights as Patrician and how far as Emperor is hard to say: see Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte*, III. 591; Steindorff, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III*; Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher des D. R. unter Heinrich IV und V*, I. Excursus IX (dealing with Damiani's curious *Disceptatio Synodalis*). Also Pflugk-Harttung in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVII. 3, p. 284 *sqq.*; and Martens, *op. cit.* I. 38.

<sup>2</sup> It is curious to note how poor Gregory VI, in his zeal for

This theory of canonical election gained a further step in the celebrated decree of Nicholas II for the election of Popes. The great object of this decree was to claim for the Roman Church the same freedom of election as was being so widely claimed elsewhere; it gave the first place in elections to the cardinal-bishops and after them to the other cardinals; it made a safeguard against interference by the Roman mob or the turbulent nobles; it left the rights of the Emperor indeterminate and therefore liable to change. There is a long and still unsettled controversy as to this decree<sup>1</sup>; it has come down to us in two forms, one more favourable to the Emperor, the other to the Church. It is perhaps doubtful which is the original form and which the forged, although opinion has lately favoured the ecclesiastical side. It is doubtful who was the forger, although some give the credit to Wibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, afterwards the anti-Pope Clement III. It has even been doubted who were most pleased with the decree or who meant to carry it out. But it may possibly be regarded as a party programme, and indeed it resembled one in the fact that no one tried to carry it into effect, although everybody in turn appealed to it. But it shewed how the current was setting in towards ecclesiastical independence. Just as cathedral chapters were gaining power in ordinary sees, so at Rome the college of cardinals was growing into coherence and gaining power. And as regards the Papacy itself, it

reform, was led to purchase the Papacy mainly by the hope of restoring its popular election as against the tyranny of the ruling families. So we read in Bonitho, *Liber ad amicum*, V. p. 628 (in Jaffé's *Mon. Gregoriana*)—‘*Cumque cepisset tyrannidem patriciorum secum tractare et qualiter sine ulla cleri et populi electione pontifices constituerent, nichil melius putabat quam electionem, clero et populo per tyrannidem iniuste sublatam, his pecuniis restaurare.*’ This was the secret of his popularity with the reforming party.

<sup>1</sup> The literature of the decree is extensive. It is enough to refer to Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher des D. R. unter H. IV. und V.*, I. Excursus VII. p. 678; to Hauck, *K.G. Deutschlands*, III. 683-4, a most useful note; Martens, *Gregor. VII.*, I. 44 sq.; and a discussion with a somewhat different conclusion by Pflugk-Harttung in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVIII. 179 sq. (‘Die Papstwahlen und das Kaisertum’).



may be noted as a sign of its growth in self-conscious strength that under Leo IX bulls ceased to be dated by the year of the imperial reign, the papal years being used instead.<sup>1</sup> The Pope held himself to be a sovereign in his own city at the very time when his powers was being exalted abroad.

Such were the circumstances of the Papacy from A.D. 1049 to A.D. 1073, the year when Hildebrand ascended the throne as Gregory VII. In the eyes of those who have looked at this period in the light of after events Hildebrand is, during all these years, the director of the papal policy, steadily working towards the conquest of the imperial and civil power, forging for the mediaeval world its fetters of papal monarchy. Then when the 'psychological moment' comes he takes the throne, which might have been his at any vacancy, and at once begins the ambitious campaign which was to plunge the world, and above all the religious world, in endless strife. But in history, as in all branches of science, we must beware of sudden creations and revolutions unprepared for. What has been already said may shew how far things had moved towards an inevitable contest between Church and State, how far things were tending towards that mediaeval monarchy which Gregory VII is often said to have created. It needed but a little further increase of momentum through the forces at work, a final impulse, and the conflict was begun.

From 1050 onwards, under successive Popes, Hildebrand was active and useful at Rome. In 1050 he was made Steward of the monastery of St. Paul; in 1053 he was sent as legate to France, where he was when Leo IX died; once again he went there as legate, an office which was beginning to have great importance, especially in view of the new activity in councils, and the greater exercise of papal power. He was also sent to quiet that centre of storms, the old Ambrosian city of Milan; and he visited the German court, where he learned to respect the Emperor and the pious Queen Agnes.

<sup>1</sup> See Pflugk-Harttung in the series of articles already referred to ('Die Papstwahlen,' etc. in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVIII. 33).

In 1059 he was ordained Deacon and appointed Archdeacon.<sup>1</sup> As holder of the office he would naturally be concerned with local administrations, and it is significant that Hugo Candidus, in proposing Hildebrand as Pope, spoke of him as having exalted the Roman Church and freed the city,<sup>1</sup> and we learn from another source that he governed the city wonderfully well. Landulf of Milan adds to this that he ruled the Roman army like a king. We hear of party feuds among the nobles, and find Hildebrand (who loved metaphors of war) raising an army by the help of Jews. The existence of the Roman militia, which he brought to efficiency, was an essential of local peace, and putting these slight details together, we can see the energetic Archdeacon laying in Rome itself the firm foundation for power which so often, by its possession or its lack, was to settle the fate of Popes. The field of his activity was thus well marked.

But it would be wrong to suppose that he was the leading figure at the Roman Court. Gregory's own expressions about his predecessors forbid us to see in him the director of their policies: he 'withstood Leo IX in the interests of Cologne; he speaks of Alexander II as having been 'led by fraud or deceit' to give 'a privilege against the ordinances of the holy fathers'<sup>2</sup>; and he speaks of him in a similar strain elsewhere. It is clear that Hildebrand was not always at one with his predecessors, whose policies differed among themselves and from his. Nor, apart from prepossessions, is there any need to expect to find an agreement. There were, moreover, others who stood before him in honour and reputation. Cardinal Humbert was a native of Lorraine, who had been educated and was, like Hildebrand, brought to Rome by Leo IX. Until his death (1061) he was a leading official, head of the Chancery, in which Hildebrand succeeded him. But his great importance was as a writer, copious and learned. His great work, the 'Three Books against Simonists,' not only depicts

<sup>1</sup> Bonitho, *Liber ad amicum*, V. p. 638. On the date see Watterich, *Vitae Pontificum*, I. 352, note to Hugo of Flavigny.

<sup>2</sup> *Mon. Greg. Reg.* VII. 24 (p. 418). See also *Reg.* VIII. 42.

the state of the Church in his day, but lays down a programme of reform. From highest to lowest all were stained by this shameful traffic ; it was as general as immorality at a time when the claim of Gregory VI that he had lived from youth in chastity, was noted as not only praiseworthy but angelic among the Romans of the day.<sup>1</sup> But so deep was Humbert's horror of simony that he saw no remedy for it save in the absolute freedom of the Church from lay interference ; even the actions of Henry III, who had saved the Papacy by his line of German Popes, was to be condemned. He saw in imagination the Emperor suffering the pains of hell for his deeds, a vision unlike that of Damiani, who hailed Henry as the young David victorious over the Goliath of simony. In the eyes of Humbert no one was an officer of the Church who was appointed by a layman ; no one was a bishop who was appointed by a king. Humbert was thus thorough-going and emphatic, trenchant in utterance, with no reserves or qualifications, able to cover over little gaps of reasoning or of evidence by a veil of sentiment or passion ; he was just the man to attract a following and to become a party-leader. The man who has intellectual reservations, who sees qualifications of general statements, often loses influence in the present, possibly to gain it in the future. But Humbert was, even in his overstatements, a great ecclesiastical pamphleteer in a day when ecclesiastical pamphlets were commoner than is often thought. Until his death he was the foremost man in the Curia, called by Damiani one of the eyes of the Pope, the other being Boniface, Cardinal-Bishop of Albano, himself a great figure in the Curia.<sup>2</sup>

Even more striking was the strange figure of St. Peter Damiani—a hermit, indeed the head of a community of hermits at Fonte Avellano. But he was a man of eloquence, who added to his eloquence learning, and to his learning wisdom. No one denounced more trenchantly the evils

<sup>1</sup> Bonitho, *Liber ad amicum*, V. p. 628.

<sup>2</sup> For Cardinal Humbert cf. Halfmann, *Cardinal Humbert, sein Leben und seine Werke* (Göttingen, 1882) ; his *Tres Libri* in the *Libelli de Lite*.

of the day, the laziness, impurity, and venality of its priests, the negligence and incompetence of its bishops ; no one used more burning words to arouse a longing for a better life. He was a great mission preacher, who would wake the Church to a sense of its mission ; he was further a man of commanding power, and as legate at synods in Italy and in Germany he had made his power felt as no weaker man could have done.

But while he wished the election of the Pope, for instance, to be absolutely free, Damiani was not prepared to shut out altogether the lay power from appointments. It was essential that Church and State should work together as they had done under Henry III, who had conquered simony as Constantine had Arianism. This was the view of the most considerable theologian of the eleventh century, the most spiritual advocate of a spiritually minded Church—one to whose learning in theology and history scanty justice has been done. The difference between him and Cardinal Humbert in regard to the power of the State should not be overlooked.<sup>1</sup>

Between Humbert and Damiani there was a further and significant difference. The former contended that all simonists were heretics, and that the ordinations of heretics were void : therefore the ordinations of simonist bishops were void. It was replied that the application of such a theory would put hundreds of priests out of the pale, and make it impossible for anyone to feel sure of the Sacraments administered to him ; endless confusion would thus be produced. Damiani, on the other hand, based his opinion on the doctrine that the unworthiness of the minister did not hinder the grace of the sacraments, and that even the sacraments of heretics were valid ; in

<sup>1</sup> His *Liber Gratissimus* and *Disceptatio Synodalis* are both in vol. i of the *Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*, in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. The former deals with the validity of sacraments administered by simonists, and lays great stress on the miracles wrought by some of them : specially interesting is the story of the demon which refused to be ejected by anybody but by Raimbaldus, bishop of Fiesole, '*dupliciter symoniacus*' (cap. xviii).



supporting his view he ranges over a large field of history and recalls unworthy Popes, such as Liberius and Vigilius, whose ordinations had been valid.

Now the controversy on this point<sup>1</sup>—a minor one in itself—absorbed much energy at the time, and it is a delicate test for discriminating between the more extreme Churchmen and those more moderate, or should we say between the coming and the passing generation. Popes had wavered in their view. Leo IX had yielded once to the extremists and thus forsaken the more tolerant view of older Romans. There is nothing to shew that Hildebrand was a leader or even a follower of the extremists. He became Pope in 1073, and under him the sin of simony was dealt with again and again. But not until 1078, in the heat of a strongly fought campaign, did a council under him at Rome declare the ordination of simonist bishops invalid. The only inference is that Gregory VII was not extreme in his day.

And the same inference may be drawn from his treatment of Berengar's view on heresy as to transubstantiation.<sup>2</sup> As legate in 1053 he had to go into the question, which, owing to the unsatisfactory conduct of Berengar no less than to the persistence of his enemies, came up again and again. Both at Tours and at Rome, Gregory was at first content with a mere confession of faith. Berengar's retraction in 1059 was drawn up by Cardinal Humbert, and his later

<sup>1</sup> It is a pleasure to refer to the admirable work of the Abbé Louis Saltet, *Les Réordinations* (Paris, 1907), where the controversy is thoroughly exhibited in chapters ix–xi. It was (p. 179 sq.) Guy of Arezzo, passing from musical notation to the discussion of heresy, who formulated the view that simony was a heresy, and invalidated ordinations by those guilty of it. Drehmann, *Papst Leo IX und die Simonie* (Leipzig, 1908), especially chapter iii, is also useful.

<sup>2</sup> See Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 247; Darwell Stone, *History of the Eucharist*, I. 244; also Harnack, *History of Dogma*, VI. 24–5. Berengar was a Nominalist before the distinctions of Nominalist and Realist were formulated. The controversy had its political side, for Berengar attacked William the Conqueror: see Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, vol. ii. 2, p. 193.

retractation in 1079, drawn up under Gregory VII as Pope, was less decided in expression and left more room for divergency of view. Both were capable of the same interpretation, but there is a remarkable difference in the way of treating both the heretic and his view. The difference ought not to be put down to Gregory's supposed friendship for Berengar, and the charge that he was himself a Berengarian is certainly untrue. But he was more concerned with peace and administration of the Church than with its controversies, more with its practice than its theology. He would for himself have been content with a positive statement of holding the orthodox faith on the part of Berengar, and it was not until Berengar's own boastful interpretations of his treatment made a further step necessary that Gregory passed beyond the statement asked for in 1078 to the retractation of 1079—which even then compares so favourably with the retractation sternly demanded by Cardinal Humbert in 1059. It would have been well had the mediaeval church followed the broader and milder policy of Gregory and avoided the error of over-definition on a point where devotion and practice mingle badly with philosophic acuteness.

Nor does a review of the beginning of Gregory's Papacy fit in with the ordinary view—repeated by writer after writer without any fresh investigation of the evidence—that he started with the intention of subjugating the imperial power. Mediaeval writers looked at him through the glare of the investiture contest and later papal policy: they were even less able than we are to rid themselves of the conceptions of their own day and enter into the differing systems of an earlier generation. Modern writers look at him too often through the mist of more recent controversies and later papal claims. In English works there has been no real advance upon Stephen and Milman, and Villemain's very inadequate French biography is still appealed to as a good authority. But Milman wrote when Lampert of Hersfeld was still considered foremost and best among mediaeval writers, before he had been sifted and criticized and pulverized by a long generation of some of the

best among German critics.<sup>1</sup> To pass from such a regard for him as Milman shews to the very critical edition of Holder-Egger is to exchange a witness whose word must be taken for one who sometimes, and sometimes only, deviates into truth. We now know Lampert as a writer who had strong dislikes (such as that against Henry IV), with equally strong likings (such as that for the great prince-bishop Anno of Cologne), who made too much depend upon the interests of his own important monastery (as, for instance, in his story of the Thuringian tithes) and who delighted in detailed accounts of negotiations which are all suspiciously alike, and all related in the phrases of Livy with a tinge of the Vulgate.

Lampert is invaluable for the light he gives us when he is not trying to coruscate. Thus, for instance, he is a church reformer with a dislike of simony and evil life, but he does not altogether like the introduction of new and stricter rules of life : he is angry when he sees canons, who might have been made respectable even if they were not so to begin with, replaced by monks of the strictest type. Interesting, too, are the pictures he gives us of ecclesiastical appointments by Henry IV,<sup>2</sup> with the deputations of chapters and local laymen at court, with the backstairs intrigues and the passage of gifts, with the pressure of the king upon electors for a candidate he favoured, and with an occasional haphazard choice when the king got tired of the wearisome business. We can see how deeply reform was needed in Germany, and yet how, when that reform was to be attempted, some of the best men would not feel inclined to move so quickly as the most rigid reformers : how this one would resent the fussiness of reformers and sigh after the older-

<sup>1</sup> The fullest treatment of Lampert's trustworthiness is to be found in Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbuch*, vol. ii. Excursus i. pp. 791-853, where the literature is referred to. The edition of his works by Holder-Egger in the smaller edition of the *Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum* is an admirable piece of work with excellent notes, which are at times perhaps too hard upon Lampert.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. pp. 239-241.

fashioned ideal of monastic life, how this one was not enthusiastic for the general enforcement of clerical celibacy, and yet how the current of reform and change had carried away even bishops of a secular type to enforce, as expected by the fashion of the day, a strictness not altogether the outcome of their own inclinations.

It is impossible to speak at length of Gregory's Papacy in its relation to German affairs. The great Emperor Henry III had died (1056) in the prime of life, and his son Henry IV was but a minor, with a weak although pious mother, and with court-factions striving for his guardianship. When he did come of age (1065), spoiled by indulgence (even if the gossip of the garrulous Bruno and the more artistically libellous Lambert be not wholly true), he attempted to enforce services and payments which had been neglected during his minority. The Saxon revolt was the result (1073), the outcome of dynastic jealousies making use of local discontent. The ecclesiastical atmosphere of Germany had changed for the worse during the minority: simony at court had increased and appointments had been made with little regard to spiritual interests. The party of reform was, if anything, losing its power, and now that the realm was divided politically, the restoration of the German Church, or rather the raising of it to a higher state of efficiency, was impossible.

But the Emperor influenced the ecclesiastical life of Italy as well as that of Germany, and here there comes before us Milan, that great city with its Ambrosian traditions, with its turbulent democracy who had taken up the campaign against the bad morals and the marriage, the simony and the sloth, of the aristocratic and well-endowed ecclesiastics. In the case of Milan civil strife had intensified ecclesiastical fashion, riot had grown into warfare; and with a city of such far-reaching influence it had become of the first importance whether Pope or Emperor was to determine the choice of archbishop, whether the caprice of the ruler or the canons of the Church should prevail. This strife Gregory inherited from his immediate predecessor, Alexander II, who shortly before his death had



excommunicated five of the advisers of Henry IV for their persistence in the Milanese succession. There was thus political trouble in Germany, ecclesiastical trouble in Italy, to heighten the difficulties which Gregory VII had to overcome.

But what had been the course of ecclesiastical legislation before his accession? A synod at Rheims (1049) under the presidency of Leo IX (whose frequent journeys had brought home to France, Germany, and Italy the connexion of the Pope with conciliar activity and legislation) had passed a canon that no one, unless elected by clergy and people, should be called to rule in the Church. This asserted the positive element of the Church's case: canonical election—as expressed by primitive canons—was to be held essential, although royal influence was not shut out. The celebrated Roman Synod of 1059 ordered that no clerk or presbyter should receive a church through laymen either for a price or freely. This canon applied not only to bishoprics, but to lesser churches as well. And the same canon was renewed under Alexander II in 1063.<sup>1</sup>

It is thus a mistake to suppose that legislation against lay-investiture began with Gregory VII. The matter had been already dealt with, the lines of policy had been already laid down, and a struggle of principles, at any rate, was inevitable. Whether this would become an actual strife—a contest for supremacy—was yet to be settled. The issue would depend upon the parties and the leaders concerned. But upon the general question of the exact

<sup>1</sup> A full summary of the legislation with a history of its effect is given by Giesebrecht in 'Die Gesetzgebung des römischen Kirche' in the *Münchener historisches Jahrbuch*, 1866. An admirable summary of the whole question of Investiture, arranged most clearly, is given by Scharnagl, *Der Begriff der Investitur in den Quellen und der Literatur der Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart, 1908), a work to which the writer is greatly indebted. See also E. Bernheim, *Das Wormser Konkordat und seine Vorurkunden* (Breslau, 1906), *Zur Geschichte des Wormser Konkordates* (Göttingen, 1878), and *Quellen zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites*, (Leipzig, 1907), a summary 'source-book,' which is very handy; and Hefele's *Koncilien-geschichte*, passim, with some cautions.

limits to be laid down for state interest or interference there were, as already noticed, different views. And the existence of these different parties, working upon different fields with differing conditions, explains apparently inexplicable changes in the later history of the investiture struggle, and its often varying course in Germany, France, and England. Lanfranc, for instance, had come to England—the local conditions of which are little known to us—with the legal and political training of an earlier generation; he knew little of the views of the extreme clerical party which gradually gained power, and pressed for victory when the struggle was begun. He and William the Conqueror were prepared to work along with the Church in the spirit of Henry III of Germany, and as the English Church was thus kept in a healthy moral state, Gregory VII did not press for England the same thoroughgoing policy which, under the evil conditions of Germany and Italy, he found it necessary to press against Henry IV. This is the true interpretation of his English policy, which cannot be explained by a fear and timidity foreign to his character. He did press for the observance of canonical election; but neither in Germany, in earlier years, nor in England throughout his pontificate was he prepared to shut out altogether the power of the State. That power might, under sovereigns like Henry III or William the Conqueror, along with prelates like Lanfranc, work for the realization of Gregory's ideal. But the realization of that ideal is a very different thing from such slavery to a theory as Cardinal Humbert and men of his school had shewn.

When Hildebrand was suddenly chosen as Pope in the tumult which burst out in a city strangely calm, he might well shrink from the task that awaited him. Now, at any rate, he was the foremost leader and the likeliest choice, but the shrinking from power and the pathetic requests for prayers which are to be found in his letters are easy to understand. They have a perfectly genuine ring, although they fit in badly with that strange idea of an ecclesiastic filled with ambition and devoted to a theory which he was prepared to force at all costs upon a world unwilling and unfit.

At first he was prepared to work with the young king ; he regarded himself as Pope as soon as he was elected ; he did not apparently trouble himself as to the exact observance of the election decree of 1059—whether it was his handiwork or that of Cardinal Humbert ; possibly no one cared to press for its full observance, although afterwards its test was applied when strife had begun. He did not ask the imperial consent, but he did put off his consecration until Gregory, Bishop of Vercelli (‘ that demon of Vercelli,’ as an enemy called him), the Imperial Chancellor of Italy, was able to come to it. His election had been on April 22, 1073<sup>1</sup> ; he was consecrated on June 30, after having been ordained priest on May 22.

Two factors in the life of the new Pope were of decisive power—his intense regard for the canons and decisions of the Church, and his great practical experience. He had caught in Germany something of that feeling with which the stricter school of reformers worked ; hence throughout his letters it is to ‘ justitia ’—the righteousness of Church law—that he appeals, to ‘ sanctorum statuta patrum,’ and he can hardly understand anyone else refusing obedience to them. This characteristic of Gregory groups him with the active lay rulers of his day, who appealed to civil laws and precedents just as he did to those of the Church. In politics and organization he was at home : from synods and armies he had gained experience. He had that with which Damiani had credited him, a power of management : in his correspondence with his legates he shews how he wishes anything of an important decision to be kept for himself.<sup>2</sup> He had some distrust of the written word, which indeed was justified by the literary ethics of the day, and he

<sup>1</sup> On the election see Lampert of Hersfeld (edited by Holder-Egger), p. 145 ; Mirbt, *Die wahl Gregors VII* (Marburg, 1892) ; Hauck, *K. G. Deutschlands*, III. p. 753 sqq. ; Langen, *Geschichte der Römischen Kirche*, vol. iv. pp. 1–7 (although all his conclusions are not to be accepted) ; and the earlier letters in the *Mon. Greg. Reg.* I. give us the Pope’s own account, which is sincere and trustworthy.

<sup>2</sup> See *Reg.* IV. 3 : ‘ de diversorum quidem diversis consiliis dubitamus ’ : then he reserves decisions for himself.

preferred the spoken word.<sup>1</sup> In the most tangled state of politics in Germany he felt sure that if he could only go there he could settle everything: he had confidence in his principles and in himself; but now he had to work on a larger scale and in a wider field.

Two points were clear: clerical celibacy<sup>2</sup>—into the arguments for it and its past history it is needless to enter now—and the absolute prohibition of simony must be enforced. Accordingly, these fundamentals were dealt with in Gregory's first Council.

Little need be said of the opposition in Italy, but in Germany intense feeling was aroused. In a German synod at Mainz, and in a diocesan synod at Erfurt, there were scenes of violence<sup>3</sup>: 'The clerks who sat around rose up and so raved against the archbishop with their hands and with movements of their bodies that he despaired of leaving the Synod along with his life.' Altmann, Bishop of Passau, found it impossible to carry his clergy with him. Thus the Church in Germany was divided in itself.

In enforcing existing legislation, with all the power of the Papacy and the experience of Gregory himself, full use was to be made of the bishops, who must be roused to a sense of their duty and their power. The outlook was saddening; there were few likeminded with the Pope,<sup>4</sup> and as only through the bishops could the Church be reformed, bishops had to be roused: the charge of simony was an instrument by which they could be brought to order.

<sup>1</sup> 'Nos non aliter regi obligatos esse, nisi quod puro sermone, sicut michi mos est.'

<sup>2</sup> As to the feeling in its favour in Germany see Hauck, *op. cit.* III. 534: at Augsburg (952), Poitiers (1000), and Pavia (1022), and frequently in Germany afterwards it was decreed. Decrees against simony were later in time but afterwards as common.

<sup>3</sup> See Lampert, p. 198 sq. (the date is uncertain: see note on p. 199 and cf. Meyer von Knonau, *op. cit.* II. 359-60): some said they would rather give up their priesthood than their wives; and p. 226 for the synod at Mainz.

<sup>4</sup> Reg. II. 49: '*vix legales episcopos introitu et vita, qui christianum populum Christi amore et non seculari ambitioni regant, invenio.*' The whole letter, to Hugh of Clugny, is interesting (22 Jan. 1075).



German bishops were summoned to Rome six or seven at a time (it is strange how sensitive they became suddenly to consideration of health and expense against the journey) ; those who submitted did not receive too heavy a punishment. There were well-founded complaints that the Pope was disregarding ordinary rules of jurisdiction. Siegfried of Mainz was angered when the complicated case of Jaromir of Prague was called to Rome without any regard to him and his right of jurisdiction ; Liemar of Bremen—who had himself been summoned to Rome and suspended for not appearing—complained ‘ this dangerous man orders us about as if we were his bailiffs.’<sup>1</sup> Gregory indeed regarded the episcopate as in theory a mere delegacy of the papal power, and he tried to make the practice correspond to this<sup>2</sup> : it was a corollary of the position given to the Pope in the newly growing canon law.

The year 1075 saw the Pope so far disappointed in his hopes of reform, and this because he had failed to carry the bishops along with him. For the Lenten Synod—yearly synods were now becoming a rule—he formed vast plans. Letters of invitation were sent to bishops and of intimation to princes.<sup>3</sup> A stronger attack was to be made upon married priests and upon simonists. But the synod did more than this, for it passed the first decree under Gregory against lay-investiture. That is to say, Gregory had been Pope for two years before he brought about what, on the common interpretation of his character, was his great desire.<sup>4</sup> But while the Church had thus strengthened its

<sup>1</sup> See Langen, *op. cit.* IV. 42, to which the writer is indebted for the reference. The passage is quoted in Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbuch*, II. 447, note 4. The whole letter is quoted in Bernheim, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites*, I. 23.

<sup>2</sup> The episcopal office is ‘ *vicariae dispensationis munus*,’ I. 12.

<sup>3</sup> See *Mon. Greg. Reg.* II. 42 and 43 for invitations. On the general plan Meyer von Knonau, *op. cit.* II. 444, is full: Hefele sums up the position of affairs well on this council.

<sup>4</sup> This decree of 1075 is a much debated point : the little definite evidence there is for it is in Arnulf of Milan : ‘ *papa habita Romae synodo palam interdicat regi, ius deinde habere aliquod in dandis episcopatibus, omnesque laicas ab investituris ecclesiarum summovet*

position, he was in no haste to make vigorous use of the decree. Indeed, he seems hardly to have expected any hostilities from the King, to whom in December 1074 he had written speaking of the decrees already passed (*sc.* in 1059 and 1063), and also of his readiness to hear the King's case to consider suggested change ; but if the customs of the Church cannot be changed, he urges Henry to obedience.<sup>1</sup> This and later letters shew that distrust of Henry, who indeed went his own way, was growing in the mind of the Pope. But nothing in his letters, nothing in his acts, favours the interpretation that he was wishful of a quarrel.

Yet the quarrel came. Henry's intercourse with his five excommunicated counsellors, his constant disregard of the laws against simony and for canonical election, seemed to shew that agreement was impossible. Victory over his Saxon rebels (June 1075) made him less anxious for peace with the Pope. The campaign against celibacy and the Pope's strictness with the bishops had lessened his influence. Cardinal Hugh the White—whose career had been by no means as spotless as might be thought—left Rome and tried to stir up enmity against Gregory at Worms (January 24, 1076). The German bishops deposed the Pope, 'their brother Hildebrand': the King, not such 'by usurpation but by the holy will of God,' bade Hilde-

*personas.*' *Mon. Germ. hist. : Script.* VIII. 27. See Scharnagl, *Der Begriff der Investitur*, 30 ; he and Bernheim, *op. cit.* 43, give the passage from Arnulf. The words of the decree we do not know, and it seems to have been passed chiefly with reference to the case of Milan, but not immediately published. This delay goes against the ordinary view of Gregory's action as to investitures. See Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbuch*, II. 451-5 ; Hauck, *op. cit.* III. 777-8. Cp. also *Reg.* II. 45 before the decree and III. 10 after it. The letters favour Arnulf.

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. Greg. Registrum*, II. 30. So he says that if the king will send ambassadors '*iustis eorum consiliis non gravabimur acquiescere et animum ad rectiora inclinare. Sin autem impossibile esse constituit rogabo et obsecrabo sublimitatem tuam, ut pro amore Dei et reverentia sancti Patri eidem ecclesiae suum ius libere restituas.*' This is not the language of a man whose mind was definitely made up for a quarrel. *Reg.* III. 7 and 10 are also significant.

brand 'the false monk' to come down. The Lombard bishops, hostile already, caught up the torch, and at Piacenza they too declared Gregory deposed. The Lenten Synod of 1076 (February 14) replied as might have been expected. The Pope excommunicated Henry, deposed him, and freed all his subjects from their allegiance. When Gregory did act he acted promptly and thoroughly. The long war of Pope and Emperor, the struggle upon investitures as one part of it, had begun.

Into that strife with its many changes we do not propose to enter here. After his princes at Tribur (October 1076) had deserted his cause, Henry was driven towards the Pope. The celebrated journey to Canossa has caught the imagination and become in one great nation a symbol of strife. On the hill at Harzburg, where once stood Henry's castle from which he had fled before the Saxon rebels, and where the rebels afterwards burnt his beloved church, now stands the Bismarck column with its medallion of the great statesman and its inscription, 'We will not go to Canossa.' But the journey now is a great deal easier, and we may be sure that Bismarck would have gone if he had had as much to gain as had Henry himself. For Henry was the gainer.

Gregory had hoped to go to Germany as an arbitrator, but his convoy failed him and Henry's arrival in Italy forestalled him. An excommunicated king, who was also rejected by his subjects, was at a double disadvantage; had the Pope gone to Germany, and there in a national synod judged the king, the victory of the Church would have been complete. But at Canossa Gregory had to choose between his duty as a priest and his policy as Pope. It was a distinction he might not have cared to make to himself, but the distinction might have made him reconsider the policy. St. Peter Damiani had seen with dislike the tendency to reach spiritual ends through political means, but he, unlike Gregory, had turned his face to the wilderness and refused to seek for enchantments.

Henry came before the Pope as a private penitent seeking absolution, and promising amendment. The absolution

was received, although it cost his friends much intercession on his behalf, and he returned home with a disabling load removed. When the threads of politics and religion were disentangled the case of the Pope against the Emperor stood alone, and was more weakly supported; the case of the German rebels against their king had to be considered apart from the stigma branded on an excommunicated man. Henry's mood of penitence soon passed away, but what he had gained—a political advantage—was left behind.<sup>1</sup>

In Gregory's later letters his plan of a visit to Germany is often spoken of, but the chance of it soon disappears. He repeats again and again his desire to go—and he stands as an impartial judge between two opposing kings—Henry, who after a time goes his old way, and Rudolf (elected by the rebels, March 1077), who obeys the laws of the Church, and is a less wayward ruler. The Rudolfians could not understand why the Pope did not help them more heartily; the Henricians never forgave him for what had been done. The position of an impartial judge became more and more hard to keep up: he had not done at Canossa, he said, anything that touched the matter of the throne. 'Then,' said Henry's enemies, 'we are still free from our oath of allegiance, as you freed us before Canossa.' And in Germany the division of the Church grew worse and worse; there were rival candidates to many sees; it was impossible to secure unity or to restore peace. It became evident that the Pope must either abstain from politics altogether or else let the course of politics constrain him. He gave way, and at the Lenten Synod of 1080 he excommunicated Henry for the second time; he gave a solemn justification of his action<sup>2</sup> in a review of his life shewing the necessity he saw placed upon him; it was impressive, but the reason given for the second excommunication—that Henry had

<sup>1</sup> As to what took place at Canossa see Lampert (ed. Holder-Egger), p. 289 sq., and Meyer von Knonau, *op. cit.* III. Excursus VII. p. 894 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Reg.* VII. 14a, Mirbt, *Die Absetzung Heinrichs IV durch Gregor VII* (Leipzig, 1890). Also Meyer von Knonau, *op. cit.* III, p. 246 sq.



impeded the assembly of a German synod to settle affairs—was not completely true. In 1078 and 1080 synods at Rome had again legislated upon investitures, but with the year 1080 Gregory's legislative activity really comes to an end. Dark days close around, Henry passes triumphantly through Italy; three times Rome is besieged, and the anti-Pope, 'the monster of Ravenna,' is enthroned in the city; nothing but the help of the faithful Countess Matilda and of his Norman vassals or allies, dreaded but useful, saved his power. The sack of the city by the Normans in 1084 left a fearful mark upon it in ravages which surpassed all those of the barbarians; the church of San Clemente, with its pathetic history so plainly marked, is a witness which speaks to-day,<sup>1</sup> in its story of abrupt destruction, of that which had lived from Constantine downwards. It would be easy to trace the effect of opposition and disappointment upon the strong, self-reliant Pope, driven into a more extreme policy but never into unrighteousness. It is tempting to see the long investiture struggle opening out before us with its controversy of pamphlets and its popular distortions of history, with its opposing factions, the neglect of whose differences makes its later history almost unintelligible. These things had their roots not so much in the days of Hildebrand as in the generation before. His Papacy is but an incident in the struggle; 1046 is a more vital date than 1073 or even 1085.

Looked at in the light of recent studies, and upon the background of disorder and controversy from which he came out, Gregory seems to lose much of the meteor-like energy, the creative power, with which he has been sometimes credited. He remains great, but great in the style of his day, fascinating but elusive in his personality.

Endless are the romances that have gathered around his name: one of the most curious, and still repeated,<sup>2</sup> is

<sup>1</sup> On San Clemente see Lightfoot's *St. Clement*, I. p. 89 sq.; Gregorovius, *City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, I. p. 110, and Lanciani.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Kulot, 'Die Zusammenstellung Pöpstlicher Grundsätze (Dictatus Papae)' in *Reg. Gregorii VII in ihrem Verhältniss zu den Kirchenrechtsammlungen der Zeit*. (Griefswald, 1907). The 'Dictatus Papae' in *Mon. Greg.*, *Reg.* II. 55a. The mistake which

that which makes him issue a decree (variously dated as 1073 and 1075) restricting the title of Pope to the Bishop of Rome. This is a mistaken account of Article XI in the *Dictatus Papae*—‘Quod hoc unicum est nomen in mundo’ (That this name is unequalled in the world). The *Dictatus* is probably a collection of sayings bearing on papal power found in various law books—those of Anselm of Lucca, of Deusdedit and Bonitho: its authorship remains uncertain, but there is a marked likeness to the expressions of Gregory and to his whole system. But this particular article is merely meant to enhance the glory of the papal dignity, and does not probably refer to any exact title. The interest, however, shewn by Gregory in the canon law should not be forgotten: he was anxious that Damiani and Deusdedit should make a collection of the laws which bore upon papal rights, and in all organization, through the increasing use of legates, the frequency of synods, the use of the Papacy as a court of first instance, and as a legislative power with rights of suspending and dispensing,<sup>1</sup> his Papacy marks a new era. Something of the same is the case as to the temporal sovereignty in Italy, and the wider claims beyond it,<sup>2</sup> where both the papal and imperial advocates appealed to Constantine’s Donation.

What, then, was it that Gregory set before himself? It seems to have been the formation of a feudal ecclesiastical state, analogous to the civil states which were growing up. Mediaeval thought assumed—as indeed Christians are bound to do—a unity in the world, a real theocracy in which every man has a place.<sup>3</sup> The mediaeval Church organized itself in an attempt to realize that unity—with the Papacy, St. Peter’s successor, as its centre and head. The supremacy

began with Baronius occurs in Benson’s *Cyprian*, p. 30, among other places.

<sup>1</sup> See Sägmüller, ‘Das Idee Gregors VII vom Primat in der Päpstlichen Kanzlei,’ *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 81, p. 577 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sägmüller again in *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 84, p. 89: ‘Die Konstant. Schenkung in Investiturstreit.’

<sup>3</sup> The mediaeval theory is best expounded in Gierke’s *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*, translated with an introduction by F. W. Maitland (Cambridge, 1900).

of the Church over the State, the immunities of the clergy, and many other consequences followed, when the Church was organized as a feudal state. Here on the one hand was the Christian idea, there on the other hand was human society. The investiture struggle was an attempt to study human society and to arrange its parts in the light of Christianity and Christian law. This was a necessary stage, not of the Christian idea, but of its application to the world and its preservation amid disorder. No age has been more fruitful in its influence upon thought. And the essential parts of the Hildebrandine system belong rather to the age than to the central figure of Hildebrand himself. Sometimes we hear the system branded as retrograde and absurd; and we too often discuss it—some controversialists are indeed bound to discuss it—with a sideways glance at our world of to-day. The inevitable result is to take sides, to condemn Hildebrand or to praise him, as the creator of the modern Papacy. But as Christian thought works itself out into Christian society, there is the constant difficulty between keeping the passing dress which has come to mean so much, and to be so much, or grasping at the thought which lies beneath. That is the riddle which the mediaeval Papacy embodies in this later day. Hildebrand reveals himself to us not as one who would force a given system upon us to-day, but as one who wrought into living fact a needed, although surely a passing, phase in the growth of Christian society: in doing it he left behind as a heritage a deeper grasp of Christian thought. There was something feudal in his strange idea of St. Peter re-embodied in himself, and he had the instinct of order, the love for precedent, which marked his day. To present Christianity in a feudal form was necessary for its preservation in a feudal world. Only so could 'righteousness' be taught. And to 'righteousness' he gave a life of toil so painful that he prayed 'the poor Jesus, through whom are all things and who rules all, to stretch forth His hand' and free him from his misery.<sup>1</sup> Until the end in exile he wrought his task.

J. P. WHITNEY.

<sup>1</sup> *Reg.* II. 49.

## SHORT NOTICES.

## I.—BIBLICAL AND KINDRED STUDIES.

*The Political and the Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris in the Second and Third Centuries.* By A. BÜCHLER, Ph.D., Principal of the Jews' College. (London: Queen's Square. 1909.)

THE city of Sepphoris, first mentioned by Josephus, deriving its name ('bird') from the fact that it was perched like a bird on a high mountain, obtained in the time of Felix a position of importance as the capital of Galilee. It is frequently mentioned in Rabbinical literature, and the central body of Rabbis, the Beth-din, was transferred there under R. Jehuda I towards the end of the second century. The Rabbis were not welcomed by the ruling and landowning class of the Galilean Jews, and it was a current saying: 'The people of Sepphoris have a hard heart; they hear the words of the Torah, but they do not bow down before it.' The political heads and social leaders were fearlessly criticized by the Rabbis for their injustice, their neglect to support learning, their dishonesty and their immorality. These attacks resulted in a long conflict which reveals several points in the inner life of the Galilean Jewish communities which have hitherto been unknown to historians; these are gathered together, with illuminating comments, by Dr. Büchler in his essay. The headings of his five chapters indicate the wide-reaching scope of the inquiry—(1) The Leaders of the Jewish Community; (2) Jewish Official Judges; (3) The Wealthy Members of the Jewish Community; (4) The Population of Sepphoris and the Scholars; (5) The Maintenance of the Scholars in Sepphoris. The authorities quoted by Dr. Büchler are given in footnotes which shed light on many passages in the New Testament (see *e.g.* the note on Matt. vi. 2, on p. 37), and are of particular interest to the student of Midrashic literature. The essay itself is written in vigorous English and can be enjoyed by the reader unacquainted with Hebrew.



The publication is the first of a series to be issued by the Jews' College, London, and we congratulate the Principal on its inception. He has given us a piece of work which is a model of careful research and orderly arrangement. The index is a full one (14 pp.), and we have observed no misprints.

*Codex Taurinensis* (Y.). Transcribed and Collated by W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., Jesus College, Cambridge. (Oxford University Press.)

THE importance of the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint has been of late years demonstrated by many scholars, notably for English readers by Professor Driver in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1890), and no one who busies himself with the criticism of the Massoretic Text is likely to neglect Klostermann's advice: 'Let him who would himself investigate and advance learning by the side of the other Ancient Versions accustom himself above all things to the use of Field's *Hexapla* and Lagarde's edition of the recension of Lucian.' To these books we can confidently recommend the addition of the collation of *Codex Taurinensis* by Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley, which represents the earliest known text of the recension of the Minor Prophets in existence.

Of the origin of the Codex nothing is known. It formerly belonged to the Dukes of Savoy and suffered considerably in the fire which broke out in the ducal palace in 1666, after which it was deposited in the library of the University of Turin, escaping the disastrous fire of 1904 from the circumstance that its place was on a low shelf from which it was easily snatched. In his preface the editor gives reasons for assigning the MS. to a period not later than the tenth century, and thinks that we may date it with some probability to the ninth. The lacunae which are to be found on every page are not such as to interfere seriously with restoration of the text, and the editor has shewn that they can be supplied from other MSS. Dr. Oesterley gives a full critical apparatus in footnotes, collating afresh some of the Lucianic MSS. in Oxford. This part of the work is done with the care which marked his previous studies in the Latin and Greek texts of the Minor Prophets, and is quite a model of what an *apparatus criticus* should be.

## II.—PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

*Theism and the Christian Faith: Lectures delivered in the Harvard Divinity School.* By C. C. EVERETT, D.D., LL.D., late Bussey Professor of Theology and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity. Edited by EDWARD HARE, A.B., S.T.B. (The Macmillan Co. 1910.) 10s. 6d.

THIS book is undoubtedly a considerable contribution to religious thought. Yet we find some difficulty in defining the value of it. It is 'Liberal' through and through, but its 'Liberalism' seems to be of a somewhat old-fashioned kind. With rough but sufficient accuracy we may say that, for Dr. Everett, religion is a psychological process which results in certain beliefs, and the Christian religion is the supreme, the 'absolute' religion because it consummates that process. But is this psychological development veridical? Dr. Everett can hardly be said to face that question. In effect, he tells us that the psychological development of religion is a result of man's increasing recognition of the three 'ideas of reason'—truth, goodness, beauty. Those ideas, however, *are* ideas, and the question of cardinal importance for us is precisely this—are they trustworthy? Nothing in the religious development described by Dr. Everett gives us a clear or decisive answer to that question. He shews us religion as a function in the life of man and asks us to trust the postulates of our activity. Here and there we find passages which suggest a different answer, passages which suggest that the psychological development leads man up to a 'consciousness of God.' This 'consciousness,' however, seems to have for content merely 'the idea of God' or some non-cognitive experience which is interpreted to be a communion with God. We do not think that, according to Dr. Everett, it includes a real apprehension or consciousness of the Divine Presence. Dr. Everett, then, shews us a psychological process, but are the beliefs which that process engenders valid beliefs? He does not tell us, and his failure to do so is perhaps to be explained by his defective conception of religion. He ignores the pragmatic element in religion—the 'interest' that governs it. He ignores the fundamental fact that religion in all its forms has its ground in man's insufficiency, in his need for help, and that this need in its highest form is a need for some sufficing assurance that the apparent contradiction between man's spiritual vocation and his natural

environment is not ultimate. Dr. Everett (we surmise) did not feel the full pressure of that need, because for him the three ideas of reason were 'absolute.' The mode of thought seems old-fashioned, and many of us do not share Dr. Everett's confidence. When those ideas are affirmed as 'absolute' the greatest venture of faith has already been made, and, unless we believed that religion contained something more than a psychological process, some of us would hesitate or refuse to make that venture.

As a philosophy of religion, then, Dr. Everett's work seems inadequate; but as a discussion of religious problems it has an unmistakable value. Immortality, Free-will, Sin, Miracles, Teleology in Nature—upon these and similar topics Dr. Everett gives us sane and suggestive thoughts. It is undoubtedly a helpful thing to see how the central points of religious interest present themselves to a cultivated and independent mind which is all the more representative because not of the first order.

Dr. Everett's theology is not orthodox, but his discussions tend plainly towards faith, and can give perplexed minds real help in their effort to hold the central religious conceptions intelligently.

*The Principles of Religious Development: A Psychological and Philosophical Study.* By GEORGE GALLOWAY, M.A., B.D., D.Phil. (Macmillan. 1909.) 10s.

DR. GALLOWAY has written a most admirable book—lucid, sane, well-informed, and undoubtedly one of the most valuable of recent contributions to religious thought. Its account of the psychological development of religion is the best that we know.

The book opens with an illuminating chapter on the conception of development. It is one that neither the politician nor the theologian can afford to ignore. The former should find its account of the social organism invaluable: the latter will find an indispensable 'furniture of the mind' in the argument which shews that the spiritual development in history is not essentially a development of society towards a mundane goal but a development of individuals towards a supra-mundane goal, in the criticism of the mechanical conception of Nature, and in the author's insistence on the teleological character of the psychological process.

Dr. Galloway rightly insists that religion is not the function of a special faculty. It is a practical determination of the whole

life, and it includes not merely feeling, not merely thought, not merely will, but all three. Its developmental process is part of the general psychological process, and therefore it is essentially teleological. What, then, is the 'interest' or 'end' which characterizes it? Apparently the writer thinks that religion arises out of man's need of help. At first that need was defined by the interests and environment of savage life, but in its highest forms it rises to a need for completeness of life through communion with God and for a sufficing assurance of the validity of our moral ideal, of the reasonableness of our vocation to a supra-mundane good. It is important to notice that Dr. Galloway reaches these conclusions without leaving the domain of psychology. He deals with religion as he finds it in history, explains its actual nature, and describes the principles which are in fact implied in its developmental process.

Clearly, however, there is an ultimate question (and one of first importance) which psychology cannot answer. What is the value of the psychological development of religion? Are its results trustworthy? According to Dr. Galloway we can construe development in history only as a development of individual lives towards a supra-mundane goal. He shews, too, that the religious and moral development of the race culminates in the thought of a supra-mundane good. But is that construing valid, is that culmination trustworthy? Is there a supra-mundane goal, a supra-mundane good? Dr. Galloway discusses this question, first of all from the standpoint of philosophy and then from that of religious experience. His philosophical discussion brings him within sight of Leibnitz, and reaches the conclusion that the universe is a system of 'centres of experience' unified by a Universal Will—a will which is, of course, teleological in its working. This conclusion, however, is a suggestion based upon the analogy of the teleological character of psychological process, and we are plainly told that it is not proven. That Universal Will is the ultimate and general ground of things. How it brings the world of particulars into being Dr. Galloway naturally leaves obscure. Apparently, that world has its ground in differences within the Divine Nature. This conception turns our thought to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, but we do not think that the writer had this especially in his mind. The critical passage suggests differences of another kind. Incidentally Dr. Galloway gives us a valuable restatement of Green's argument to a spiritual principle in knowledge, and very sane



and illuminating criticism of various forms of Idealism and of Pragmatism. His own judgement seems to incline towards a form of Realism. When we review the religious part of Dr. Galloway's discussion we are conscious of a difficulty. Does religion give us a real apprehension of God? Is God immediately present as an object in our religious experience? Many passages in this book suggest that He is, but that result seems inconsistent with its writer's general philosophy and with his criticism of Mysticism. Moreover, it does not seem to be required by his fundamental conception of religion. A Will which is the universal ground of things *cannot* be an immediate object in any human experience. On the whole we are inclined to think that, according to Dr. Galloway, religion gives man an aspiration, a belief, a hope—not anything that could properly be called an immediate apprehension of God. If this interpretation be right, Dr. Galloway leaves us with a psychological development supported by an unverified venture in philosophy. Clearly, man's religious development can become complete only in and through supernatural religion. The psychological process of religious development can be completely validated only by something beyond itself. About all this, however, Dr. Galloway is regrettably silent.

Two final comments must be made: (1) Dr. Galloway describes dogma as the interpretation of Christian experience. Verbally, that is the purest Modernism. But what is Christian experience? Is its content wholly a 'feeling-content'? Is it wholly an 'internal experience,' or does it include elements which are 'external'? In other words, is it *merely* subjective, or does it include elements which are not merely subjective—for instance, an imparted doctrine or an instituted sacrament? (2) Dr. Galloway says some hard things about the *opus operatum* and what he calls 'Sacramentarianism.' He understands so clearly so many difficult things that one hesitates to say that he does not understand the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments. Yet this seems to be the case. The last chapter of the book contains a very helpful discussion of the problem of evil and of Immortality.

*Science and Immortality.* By R. C. MACFIE, M.A., M.B., C.M. (Williams and Norgate.) 5s.

MR. MACFIE has written a most interesting fantasy, and has appropriately dedicated it to Sir Oliver Lodge. In his opening

chapters he gives a fascinating account of the new scientific conceptions which have transformed our thought of the material universe. In those chapters we have the permanent interest of his book. In other chapters he develops those conceptions into a religious view of the world, and *there* we have his incredible fantasy.

According to Mr. Macfie, the characteristic achievement of modern physical science is nothing more nor less than *the de-materialization of matter*—‘nothing more spiritual than matter can be conceived’ (p. 198). At one time it was generally believed by men of science that matter is a complex of material units. Those ultimate units were called atoms. It has now been discovered that each atom is a physical system of unimaginable complexity. It is not an impenetrable and indivisible piece of matter; it is a complex of electrons which revolve round a shifting centre with unimaginable rapidity. Sir Oliver Lodge tells us that ‘a portion of substance consisting of a billion (a million million) atoms is only barely visible with the highest powers of the microscope.’ Yet an atom of mercury is said to contain 100,000 corpuscles, and each of these corpuscles is ‘intensely, wondrously alive.’ Each atom is a solar system in miniature—a solar system immensely more complex than the one we familiarly know. This is marvellous enough, but it is not the end of the matter. Those ultimate electrons are said to be immaterial. They are described as disembodied charges of electricity, and we are told that there is no reason to suppose that they have a material nucleus or substratum. Matter is said to be a merely subjective construction. The ultimate physical reality has none of the properties of matter. These are merely names which designate the effects produced in us by the interplay of rotating units which are immaterial. The physical universe is a system of immaterial electrons. But even these electrons are not ultimate physical existents. More ultimate than the electrons is the ether—out of which the electrons arise. ‘An electron,’ says Sir Oliver Lodge, ‘is only a peculiarity or singularity of some kind in the ether’ (p. 104). The conclusion of the story is said to be this—matter is ‘a temporary whirl or strain in the ether’ (p. 104). And what is ether? Something which conjoins apparently inconsistent qualities and is (as Mr. Macfie himself admits) quite incomprehensible. It is ‘so dense that matter by comparison is like gossamer,’ and yet it is imponderable. It is more rigid than

steel, and yet the planets pass through it without friction. The 'atomic miniatures of solar systems are only strains in this marvellous medium' (p. 111). The story is of absorbing interest, and yet it is so incredible that we find relief in remembering that it has no primary philosophical importance. Turn now to Mr. Macfie's theological development. We abridge it accurately. The corpuscles of the atom have been proved to be nothing but electricity; and electricity is nothing but waves of ether. And what is ether? 'Ether is nothing save force; it is no more solid than a symbol, no heavier than an hypothesis' (p. 198). 'Immaterial energy may seem inconceivable, but nevertheless it is a scientific fact' (p. 199). Matter is 'force and nothing but force—nothing but mental effects of a certain kind, produced by forces which are neither visible nor ponderable. All the whirling worlds, all the dancing atoms, are merely our subjective projections of various forms of force impinging upon us' (p. 201). 'Force, in its ultimate analysis, is *conscious motion* resulting in new conscious experience' (p. 201). 'We cannot empty the idea of force of its psychological significance. The term and the idea are derived from our own conscious action. The moment we identify matter with force, we identify it with Conscious Will and Conscious Being. There is no way out of it. What was formerly called the substance of matter is now known to be Force; and the Force is recognized to be the Soul or Will of God' (p. 202).

Our comments must be very brief: In the first place it is clear, from Mr. Macfie's own account, that ether is much more than force. 'Maxwell supposed it to be formed of tiny spheres rapidly rotating. Mendeleef reached the conclusion that it is an inert gas. . . . Others again have pictured it as a homogeneous elastic jelly; others have suggested that it may be fibrous, like a bundle of hay' (p. 109).

Secondly, it is probably true to say that our conception of force has its psychological ground in what we ordinarily call 'experiences of volition.' It is quite unwarranted and misleading to identify Force with 'Conscious Will and Conscious Being.' From the fact (if it be a fact) that our experiences of conscious volition give us the idea of Force we cannot immediately infer that Force is essentially Conscious Volition. The *genesis* of an idea is one thing; the *meaning* of it is quite another.

Mr. Macfie's argument for immortality is accurately indicated

by the following excerpts: 'There is no matter apart from consciousness' (p. 275). 'We cannot talk about the beginning and end of consciousness' (p. 274). 'When we talk of *beginnings* and *ends* of consciousness we talk nonsense' (p. 273). '*There is really no death*' (p. 275). The philosophy which underlies these excerpts is now undergoing severe and damaging criticism, but Mr. Macfie seems quite unaware of this. Even if his argument were valid it would merely shew that consciousness of some kind exists eternally. It leaves open the disagreeable possibility that death will finally dissolve the particular personality which makes a man what he now is.

*After Death, What?* By CESARE LOMBROSO. Rendered into English by W. S. KENNEDY. (Fisher Unwin. 1909.) 10s. net.

THIS is a book which may well interest a large circle of readers. That there is a considerable portion of the reading public which resolutely refuses either to discuss or to peruse any literature on the subject of spiritualism or of psychical phenomena is but a witness to the fact that none can remain wholly disinterested in the matter, and therefore accounts for the avidity with which books on the subject coming from far less distinguished pens than that of Professor Lombroso are devoured. Even for those whose imaginative temperaments are such as to leave them in the least possible degree concerned with speculations as to the persistence of personal consciousness after death, this book cannot fail to be an interesting study not only as the work—the last word, and, in his own words, the crown of his life's work—of a man whose previous labours in the field of science had seemed completely alien to investigations such as those with which this book deals, but also as shewing a very strange mixture of accurate and keen investigation of evidence, side by side with an almost naive propensity to form what, to most of us, must at best appear strangely rash and unfounded conclusions.

Professor Lombroso tells us that 'if ever there was an individual in the world opposed to spiritism by virtue of scientific education and, I may add, by instinct, I was that person,' while for 'years and years' he had 'laughed at the idea of centre-tables and chairs having souls.' The completeness of his conversion can be measured when we read his description of the occurrences of which he was personally cognisant in the house of an unfortunate innkeeper of Turin—one Fumero.



'A vase of flowers *descended* [the italics are ours] safely on to a table from the moulding above the door. . . . Two bottles *came down* from a high shelf—they were not broken but bruised the elbow of a porter.' In the cellar 'two bottles, then four, and later others . . . *separated themselves* from the rest and fell to the floor without any violent motion.' They did not break until after they had settled themselves there, and even then two had the consideration to remain intact. 'Two or three chairs bounced round with such violence that they were broken,' while, most unusual of all, 'a pair of shoes that were in the bedchamber *came downstairs* in broad daylight, *traversed* the servant's room *in the air*, *passed* into the common room of the inn and there fell at the feet of two customers who were seated at a table.'

The earlier Lombroso is revealed in some very interesting chapters on mediums and spirits of the dead among savage tribes (cc. v and viii). Chapter viii, moreover, contains some fruitful considerations as to the possible explanation of oracles and the like among ancient peoples. Again the careful investigator is apparent in the chapter (iii) on experiments with accurate scientific instruments, as in the writer's readiness to look for and describe the tricks and conscious as well as unconscious deceptions of psychic subjects. One is tempted also perhaps to trace in the descriptions of apparitions and phantasms a characteristically materialistic conception of the facts which Professor Lombroso considers proved concerning life after death.

But only the converted Lombroso surely could write the following paragraph concerning the appearance on photographic plates of phantasmal forms around a medium :

'In the first pose there is a star; in the second pose the star is transformed into a sun; in a third the sun is enlarged; in the fourth the sun is still larger and out of it a human head unlimns—*which proves the operant force of an intelligence that shapes these nebulous forms at will as the artist shapes the clay.*'

One would be obliged to believe that the translator had misrepresented the writer's thought, were it not for many other passages and statements in accordance with these startling conclusions as to what may or may not be considered 'proved.' For instance, surely few could feel the following 'communication' of a certain Mr. Hyslop a 'proof of psychic identity.' The departed Mr. Hyslop, after referring to a penknife which he used to cut his nails with and then return to his vest pocket—an inaccuracy, said a living relative, for the departed kept it in a trousers' pocket—

'went on to speak of a ledge that he wanted to repair and of taxes he had not paid before he died. The same foolish trifles, little errors,

instances of lack of precision, which are constantly observed in the speech of mediums and their guides, or controls . . . are really a proof of identity, since they are a peculiar characteristic of them all, being in fact just what we might expect, since we are concerned, not with complete organisms, but fragments, which at least think and feel as we think and feel in dreams and which, if they were of weak mind when living, we should expect to be so much the more so after death.'

The chapter on haunted houses will please all who like weird stories, but it displays an extraordinary readiness to accept all manner of such tales, while the writer gives with complete seriousness one story of a double's appearance on the sole evidence of two schoolgirls; and relates as established historical fact in supporting his conclusions Boccaccio's story of the finding of the thirteen lost cantos of the *Paradiso* through a dream of Dante's son. (The allusion in one place to the finding of the thirteenth lost canto is an error doubtless due only to the translator.) Again, it seems that to Professor Lombroso there is nothing surprising in the belief (in which he follows Dante) that the departed have a gift of foreseeing the future, while they are in complete ignorance of all past events since their death. The last chapter on the Biology of the Spirits is, however, the most startling in the book. Take the following statements in proof of the credibility the writer expects in his readers concerning so obscure a subject :

'The phantasm has the negative property, so to speak, of dissolving under the influence of strong light—as wax is melted by heat. This was noticed in *two* experiments with Katie King. *We see by this how it is that phantasms do not manifest themselves in the daytime. . . .* In the instance of the flying brothers of Bari it was *proved* that they had been able to transfer themselves (as if they were discarnate) over a distance of 45 kilometres in 15 minutes (fact authenticated and vouched for by the Bishop of Bari).'

'According to Aksakoff, the spirit of a typographer once printed in the journal for which he had worked the notice, "To-day at 3 o'clock — died!" *Inasmuch as no one knew of the death and would not have had the time or the inclination to write such a communication, it must have been his spirit that had evoked it.'*

And surely the following instance of the absent-mindedness of genius in its relation to the 'influence of the unconscious over his soul' shews a great confusion of thought between what may be considered a case of the waking of the so-called sub-conscious mind and the normal limitations of even the most powerful intellects.

'Manzoni's fits of distraction were very strange, although he was endowed with so powerful a memory that he knew by heart the whole of Virgil and Horace. Once in a dispute about some historical topic it occurred to him to see what Gibbon said about it, and he found in the volume a marginal note by himself on the very point under discussion. "See what a memory I have," he said, laughing.'

Surely it is a commonplace not bearing on this subject that a remarkable verbal memory is often balanced by a less good memory in other ways than is often possessed by less well endowed intelligences.

But in spite of the very unsatisfactory nature of the last two chapters and of the fact that the Lombroso of *After Death, What?* is curiously lacking in the caution to be expected from so eminent a man of science, there is no reason why we should refuse to give due attention to the weightier parts of the book and to certain constantly alleged facts for which no adequate explanation is as yet forthcoming. Nor, while the picture which he presents to us of the nature of the possible communication between the living and the dead is such that to few of us would it offer the slightest attraction, only still fewer of us can be indifferent to the problem which Professor Lombroso believes, as we think most erroneously, can be solved by a progressive evolution of means of communication from a table through a planchette and scientific instruments.

*Metaphysica Fratris Rogeri de Viciis Contractis in Studio Theologie.* Edidit ROBERT STEELE. (London: Moring.)

MR. STEELE's careful edition from a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale of the fragment of Roger Bacon's *Metaphysica* dealing with the faults incident to the study of theology is a valuable addition to our material for the history of mediaeval philosophy. Published a short while ago by Messrs. Moring, it has since been reissued with an edition from the same hand of the more important *Communia Naturalia* by the Clarendon Press. The work now before us does not, it must be admitted, shew its author at his best. Its object is to call the philosophers as witnesses to the faults of theological study and their remedies. One is reminded of Francis Bacon by the enumeration of the *signs* of human ignorance and their *causes* with which the fragment, after a few introductory sentences, begins. The fantastic view of ancient history and literature which is revealed illustrates the inferiority in general scholarship (though of course

not in speculative power) of the Schoolmen to such a son of the abortive humanist Renaissance of the twelfth century as John of Salisbury. The argument for the need of a revelation, and, from the superiority of Christ and His legislation to Moses and Mahomet and theirs, for the Christian religion as meeting this need, is interesting to the historian of apologetics. The end of the fragment illustrates the importance attached by Bacon to judicial astrology.

### III. LITURGICA.

*The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai.* 'Texts and Studies.' Vol. VIII. No. I. By Dom R. H. CONNOLLY, M.A. With an Appendix by EDMUND BISHOP. (Cambridge University Press. 1909.) 6s. net.

THE Homilies of Narsai, now printed in English by Dom Connolly with a useful introduction, constitute one of those early expositions of liturgical rites which are of such inestimable value for the criticism and elucidation of the history of the different rites. In these Homilies we find a full description of a Eucharistic Liturgy of the Persian family, which enables us to institute a very close comparison between the rite of to-day and that of the time of Narsai (c. 500 A.D.); and a less detailed description of the corresponding rite of Baptism. This is indeed a 'find,' albeit the Persian rite is (to most liturgical students) less interesting than many others; and it is, we believe, the earliest systematic explanation of any liturgy that has come down to us.

In the Baptismal service we notice the curious peculiarity that in this rite there was no anointing after baptism, and Dom Connolly in the Introduction seems to have clearly demonstrated that this was the original custom, and that a post-baptismal unction which is sometimes met with in the rite was an innovation of about the middle of the seventh century.

Dom Connolly gives us in parallel columns an elaborate table of the various elements of the liturgy as mentioned by Narsai, and as given in Mr. Brightman's *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I.; and afterwards parallelizes Narsai's description of the Anaphora with the corresponding prayers of the 'Liturgy of Nestorius' of the same rite. Unfortunately he seems not to have realized the fact that the 'framework' of the liturgy does not belong specifically to the Liturgy of Addai and Mari, but is common to all the liturgies of the rite.



There are several points worthy of notice in regard to the liturgy—the inclusion of the Creed at a date earlier than had been previously known in any liturgy, the absence of a veil or screen which shut out the act of consecration from the view of the congregation, the silent recitation of the prayer of consecration, and the early development of considerable ceremonial magnificence, though the mass-anthems appear to have been still undeveloped. In the Appendix Mr. Bishop contrasts this latter point with the development in the West, where the singing soon attained to a high level of development, though the ceremonial remained comparatively simple.

But great as is the interest of Narsai's Homilies, the interest of Mr. Edmund Bishop's Appendix appears to be even greater. Everything that falls from this distinguished writer is valuable, and we think that in this Appendix he has given us of his very best, including results of laborious investigation conducted with rare critical ability. Mr. Bishop is an acute critic of accepted liturgical traditions, and leads us to examine afresh our real data for such beliefs as, *e.g.* that an invocation of the Holy Spirit is part of the primitive form of Consecration, or that the Diptychs are a part of the 'primitive liturgy'; his trenchant criticism overthrows one of Mgr. Duchesne's most striking positions (p. 115), and puts in a clear light the apparent confusion between the 'Logos' and the 'Spirit' which is to be perceived in the early Christian literature (p. 159 *sq.*) Under the heading 'Diptychs,' Mr. Bishop notices the fact that in the West the early evidence has to do with the names of the offerers (*i.e.* of the living), but in the East with those of the dead; he concludes that 'the public recital of the names of the dead would seem to have been introduced into the mass in the East in the course of the fourth Century.' He doubts whether the diptychs of the dead, 'containing lists of particular bishops of particular sees of France or Italy,' may not have 'been introduced into the West with much other Byzantine or Eastern Church practice in the course of the sixth and seventh Centuries' (p. 113 *sq.*).

Mr. Bishop would revolutionize the conceptions as to the diaconal litanies which we derive from the existing texts of the Eastern Liturgies. These litanies are now found in all Eastern rites, but Narsai omits all mention of them, and Mr. Bishop concludes that they have been introduced not only into the Persian rite, but into the liturgy of Jerusalem and that of Egypt. He believes the origin of these litanies is to be found at

Antioch in the course of the fourth century, and that from Antioch they spread rapidly to Constantinople. It appears to us that though there is probably a great deal of truth in this opinion, yet some of these litanies (which mention those condemned to the mines) must have an origin not later than A.D. 230; and we believe that the Mozarabic litany, '*Ecclesiam sanctam Catholicam in orationibus in mente habemus*,' can be traced back to the third century both in Spain and in Africa.

The weightiest portion of the Appendix is, however, that in which Mr. Bishop discusses 'The Moment of Consecration.' He sees that

'if the Invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom had been designed as a prayer for the Communicants, and the *supplices te rogamus* of the Roman Canon as a prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the bread and wine, the persons who wrote these prayers . . . could hardly have conceived formulae . . . less apt to express what they meant to say.'

He says of the Roman Canon that the answer to two questions is indisputable: (1) Does it contain an 'invocation' on the bread and wine? Yes. (2) Does it contain an invocation of the Holy Ghost on the bread and wine? No. And he proceeds to give very weighty reasons for thinking that an invocation of the Holy Ghost is not earlier than the fourth century in any liturgy. Whatever may be the ultimate issue of investigation concerning the various points raised in this Appendix, it is very useful to have the foundations of current notions so boldly challenged, and to have so admirable an example of the right method of liturgical investigation put before us.

#### IV. HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

*England Before the Norman Conquest.* By CHARLES OMAN.  
(Methuen and Co. 1910.) 10s. 6d. net.

STUDENTS of Early English history have long needed a book in which the results of the minute work of specialists, so constant during the last twenty years, should be summed up. Dr. Hodgkin's volume, which might have given this, proved rather to be a highly attractive individual study, dwelling on points which interested the writer, often side issues or special studies, than a summary of the whole history according to the standards of recent knowledge. Meanwhile the advance of specialist investigators has left Mr. Freeman's once famous first volume a monument of brilliant insight and almost guesswork, remarkable

as a prelude to later work, but wholly inadequate in itself; and the clever books of John Richard Green, the 'Making' and the 'Conquest' of England, have been relegated, by the criticism of Mr. W. H. Stevenson and others, to the shelves where lingers the light literature of the past, undisturbed by nearness to the serious works of historians. Mr. Oman, Chichele Professor of Modern History at Oxford, has now stepped in to supply the very book that was needed.

Mr. Oman's book is so large and covers so long a period—from 'before the dawn of history,' in fact, to 1066—that we cannot deal with it in detail, and must be content to point out only a few of its salient features. In the first place, it is in far better proportion than any of its predecessors. The prehistoric days, the Roman conquest and occupation, and the Celtic history, its interest and its survivals, are no longer disposed of in a few hasty pages: they occupy quite a third of the book. If Mr. Oman is a little impatient with the anthropologists and the astronomers, with the scholars who have devoted so much ingenuity to palaeolithic and neolithic men and their monuments, he gives a very clear and thoroughly sound summary of the certain results at which they have arrived. With the Roman occupation he deals quite differently. He has carefully studied and systematized all the scattered work of Professor Haverfield, and while collecting its results in a coherent and brilliant survey, he has tested them all with his own acute critical power and the wider knowledge of early British authority which he possesses. The chapters on the Romans in Britain are by far the best study of the subject that has ever appeared. They are intelligible, accurate, and, so far as is possible to our knowledge, complete. No one who wishes to understand the early history of our country, or indeed the nature of Roman rule in the distant parts of the Empire, can possibly neglect them. They must be read and re-read with close attention, which they will repay in pleasure and profit.

And they are an excellent illustration of the nature of Professor Oman's work throughout his book. He has taken infinite pains to master the investigations of modern scholars, Roman, Celtic, English, and to give us the achieved results of their labours. But he has never been contented with this. His book is very far from being a mere summary, however brilliant, of other men's work: it is throughout brightened and clarified by the author's own original study. Instances of this, in chapter

after chapter, strike the reader, and will be noted for reference. The most notable is the constant use made of the author's special knowledge of the coinage. Again and again this comes in to illustrate a historical detail or even to establish, on irrefragable foundations, a new conclusion: the work is most brilliant and most original. Again, we notice the constant use made of Celtic sources, of the different remains of Welsh literature. Here Mr. Oman is quite new in many of his illustrations, and he succeeds in adding a very great deal to some of the most obscure parts of our early history. Other points which may be observed are the close attention which is paid to geography, to the growth of institutions—there are here several chapters which might give even specialists new lights—and to the history and influence of the Church. Lastly, we may note that Mr. Oman is never ashamed, when he has not made up his mind, to say so. Instances of this are the landing place of Augustine, as to which he leaves us undecided, and the meeting place with the Welsh bishops, where, so far as he does decide, we must admit that he seems to us not fully to have considered the evidence.

*The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century.* By ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D. (Methuen and Co. 1910.) 2s. 6d.

DR. PLUMMER is so accomplished a writer that he may be read with advantage, even when he deals with subjects which are not especially within the range of his particular studies. The volume before us is an example of the ease and zest with which he enlivens the study of English Church History. His lectures on earlier periods—the Elizabethan Reformation, and the Age of the Stewarts—are well known and deserve all the praise they have received. If the present sketch is less successful, that is to be attributed to no failure of vivacity or knowledge on the part of Dr. Plummer, but rather to the fact that the eighteenth century does not yield itself easily to the style of treatment in which he excels. He is illustrative and discursive, and the story of that century is discursive enough already; it needs compression and synthesis, which do not naturally fall into Dr. Plummer's manner of writing English history. The history of the Church in this period has been written so often and so fully of recent years that there is really nothing new to tell. Knowing this, Dr. Plummer has been led to diverge widely from Church history, to give lists of men of letters, and to tell sad stories of the



death of kings, and, with more justification, to write an interesting chapter on the colonies and episcopacy. Thus his book is largely a sketch-history of English literature, with agreeable digressions on English politics, and the really important facts belonging to the history of religion are not given their just portion of space. We need not say that all that Dr. Plummer writes is interesting, or that very little indeed is inaccurate, but this book of his must be regarded rather as a collection of attractive essays than a history of the English Church in the eighteenth century.

*The Cambridge Modern History.* Vol. VI *The Eighteenth Century.* (Cambridge University Press. 1909.) 16s.

THE editors, the Master of Peterhouse, Dr. George Prothero, and Mr. Stanley Leathes, have introduced this volume by a much longer preface than usual, in which they endeavour, with some success, to take a synthetical view of the tendencies and results of the whole eighteenth century. It was a wise, perhaps a necessary, introduction to a series of chapters which, in the nature of things, could hardly fail to lack something of coherence. The eighteenth century was *par excellence* the cosmopolitan age: never did statesmen (or travellers) pass so easily from service to service, from country to country, or from observation to action. Sovereigns and statesmen were not merely great national, they were great European, figures; and yet one is forced to remember, when one reviews the history or re-reads the memoirs, how limited still was the scope of even the greatest of the great men—Frederick the Great, for example, or Alberoni, or Catherine II. Thus the writers in this volume have done good service in calling attention to somewhat neglected sides of their activity—to Frederick II's indebtedness, for example, to the methods of French administration.

The volume confirms the claims of the Cambridge History to be a necessary part of a library that makes any endeavour to be complete. It is the best summary of modern history that we possess: more lucid than the German works, more complete and original (though undeniably less attractive) than the fascinating general history of MM. Lavissee and Rambaud. We may not like it altogether: we may think it here hasty and there pedantic; but certainly we cannot do without it. A few words must express the special merits of the present volume. The heroes and veterans of it are the Master of Peterhouse,

with that sure touch of his in the diplomatic details of European history which adds so greatly to the freshness of our knowledge of English politics; Mr. Edward Armstrong, whose knowledge of Spain and France in the early years of the century is unique and is expressed with a refreshing interspersing of epigram which enlivens the most arid summary of events; the late Mr. Nisbet Bain, whose knowledge of Russian and Polish history had not tempered the vehemence of his opinions of Russian characters; and Mr. George Edmundson, whose knowledge of colonial history, admittedly so complete, is here seen to be supplemented by a very considerable acquaintance with Spain and Portugal in the eighteenth century. The only part of this period which we find inadequately dealt with is the history of the Jesuit settlements in South America, which, considering the growth of our knowledge on the subject recently, is quite deplorably compressed.

Mr. C. T. Atkinson writes very well, and *con amore*, of military matters, supplemented by Dr. Emil Daniels on the Seven Years' War. Mr. Temperley deals with Walpole; a German critic, Dr. Wolfgang Michael, with the elder Pitt; Mr. J. M. Rigg with 'the King's friends'; and Mr. Martin Griffin, of Canada, with the life of the younger Pitt. The English history continues to be the weakest side of the book; but two literary chapters—notably the very brilliant one by Mr. A. L. Smith on English Political Thought (part of it belated and belonging to an earlier volume)—do something to correct this weakness.

For India the editors have secured the assistance of Sir Alfred Lyall, who writes a brilliant introduction, and of Mr. P. E. Roberts, so long the assistant of the late Sir William Hunter in research and a most careful and most judicious writer. We observe with some amazement that the editors now seem to have yielded to the modern official spelling points on which, in a volume already published, they held out. Mr. Robert Dunlop's Irish chapter should be studied attentively: it is eminently careful and just. Mrs. H. M. Vernon, already so favourably known by her studies in earlier Italian history, writes a first-rate chapter on Italy and the Papacy. And Professor Eugène Hubert, of the University of Liège, summarizes the work of Joseph II, greatest, most unfortunate, and most misrepresented of all the eighteenth century monarchs.

This is a review, brief indeed, of what is to be found in the volume. Criticism in detail is impossible, but we may

say that while we are far from regarding the work as impeccable, the standard of accuracy attained seems to us to be higher than before: the impartiality was always a strong feature of the work.

*Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum.* The Latin Text with an English Rendering, Notes, and an Historical Introduction. By F. G. STOKES. (Chatto and Windus. 1909.) 25s. net.

THERE are few more curious relics of the Middle Ages than these 'Letters of Obscure Men,' one of the keenest and, if we are in the mood, one of the most amusing satires ever launched at pretentious ignorance. Mr. Stokes quotes in his introduction the delightful saying of Gregory the Great, 'The place of prepositions and the cases of nouns I utterly despise, since I deem it unfit to confine the words of the celestial oracles within the rules of Donatus'; but what may pass for a pleasingly human aberration in a learned Pope became a menace to all progress in knowledge when adopted as their deliberate attitude by the opponents of the New Learning. The Reuchlin controversy and the absurdities of Pfefferkorn the 'converted' Jew may be of only minor interest at the present day, but the struggle between the Theologians and the 'Artists' had more far-reaching consequences than that merely of preventing, as is still the case, a student at Oxford or Cambridge from taking a degree in Divinity unless he has already obtained one in Arts. And from this point of view the Letters are of permanent value, for behind Reuchlin's efforts to save Hebrew books from destruction at the hands of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans, who were seeking to burn all that they did not understand, lay the cause of freedom for scholarship and the right to tread the new avenues of knowledge opened up by the revival of Learning.

In Latin incredibly canine and with a mixture of pompous seriousness and unblushing impudence the friends and pupils of Ortwin Gratius of Deventer, Magister of Cologne, are represented as addressing to him a series of letters in which they discuss with fine indifference such questions as whether the Pope can depose the Emperor, whether an appeal lies from the Pope to a council, whether a candidate for the doctorate in theology is properly described as 'magister nostrandus' or 'noster magistrandus,' the spiritual interpretation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, connexions between classical mythology and Scripture which are usually absurd and often blasphemous,

whether a man who eats an egg on a Friday is guilty of mortal sin, should the egg perchance be a bad one, or if the mites in cheese can be regarded as 'fish' as one of them has been assured by a doctor, *qui est valde bonus Phisicus*. Interspersed with these grave matters are accounts of the Reuchlin suit at Rome which present the Curia as lending itself to the longest purse, arguments in defence of the Dominicans more damaging than any direct attack, and recitals of the progress of the love-affairs of Ortwin's correspondents in which they shamelessly assume that his personal experience will render him a ready and skilful adviser in such cases, however unseemly.

But for the student of mediaeval manners and customs the chief interest of this 'scandalous libel' (as Pope Leo X called it in 1517, moved doubtless more by the covert attacks on the theologians and the Curia than by the aspersions on the possibly blameless character of poor Ortwin Gratius) lies in the enormous amount of miscellaneous information which the Letters contain as to life in the Universities at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Apart from references to Grocyn, Linacre, and Croke, 'who lectures on Greek and comes [marvellous as it may seem] from England,' the details relate naturally to Germany, France, and Italy. Here is a student trudging to Cologne in a *magna cappâ cum liripipio nigri coloris* with ten florins in his pouch, the gifts of his fond father; here another making his way to Heidelberg, where he secures on his arrival a post as cook in a hostel, receiving his victuals in return and money besides, whereby he will be enabled to proceed Magister in due course. He becomes a freshman (*beanus*: the 'bejant' still of a Scottish University) and takes the oath at matriculation to compass the good of the University. Lectures on the *Posterior Analytics* or Valerius Maximus are diversified by 'ragging' the Regent of the hostel, or parading the streets with weapons and pieces of lead attached to a cord which he can throw and draw back again. Or, if the student is less strenuous, the tedium may be relieved (and memory aided) by drawing pictures to illustrate his Vergil, or by the new invention of packs of cards from which he may learn grammar and logic, or by games of checkers intended to teach him the quantity of syllables, which, however, a theologian ought to despise. Another, a modest youth from Leipsic, being at Frankfort fair sees two men in black tunics and great hoods with lappets (*magna caputia cum liripipiis*), and anxious to shew them the 'debita reverentia,'



enjoined, no doubt, by his own statutes as by those of Oxford to-day, takes off his cap (*birettum*)—only to be told by his companion that they are not Doctors of Divinity but Jews, and that he has been guilty of mortal sin. A similar mishap to a short-sighted cardinal of Lyons led, as Evelyn recounts, to Jews in Rome being forbidden to wear red hats. We cannot pursue the student's progress till, after examination, 'he is privileged to wear a gold ring and a silken lining to his cape' (*sericum sub cappa*) and has reached such heights of learning as to derive his own title from 'magis' and 'ter,' because a Magister knows three times as much as a simple person. Nor can we do more than mention references to the Holy Coat of Trèves, to the Doctors of Cambridge hunting for heresy in Erasmus' commentary on St. Jerome, or the Pope's grief at the death of his wonderful elephant, for which he gave 1000 ducats, and which when it saw him would kneel and cry in a terrible voice, 'Bar, bar, bar.'

It says not a little for Mr. Stokes' industry and skill that he should have provided in the introduction and notes to this extraordinary work a very mine of information, and in the translation a rendering which reproduces with a great measure of success the pompous and grotesque diction of the original without offending against decorum. We have noted a certain number of passages in which a correction or an additional reference might with advantage be made, but the only serious mistake is that of placing the translation of Letters like these quite apart from the original text. The typography and appearance of the book reflect the highest credit both on the printers and publishers.

*The Last Phase of the League in Provence.* By MAURICE WILKINSON. (Longmans. 1910.) 4s. 6d. net.

MR. WILKINSON'S monograph is of a somewhat novel kind. He publishes a considerable amount of original material hitherto lying in manuscript at Marseilles, Aix-en-Provence and Carpentras (Vaucluse), unaltered and unmodernized, but he weaves all this into a coherent and agreeable history of the state of affairs in Provence between 1588 and the Edict of Nantes. The work has been admirably done: the material is not only novel but full of interest, and the general effect of the book is worthy of the highest praise. Mr. Wilkinson analyzes the parties in Provence, and emphasizes, as his material enables him to do with considerable point, the intense nationalism of

the 'county.' Though the Provençals almost by nature belonged to the party of the League, and they distrusted the royal governors not only for themselves, their tyranny and their troops (many of whom were Protestants), there was a still stronger feeling directed against the central authority. This was based on the survival of independent feeling, then strong, and even now, as Mr. Wilkinson (who knows Provence very thoroughly) says, surviving. It was strong, though not definitely organized, in the sixteenth century; as strong as in the Protestant Languedoc.

'Two centuries later there is strong reason for thinking that the enthusiasm of the South for the Revolution was based on hopes that some large measure of local independence would be gained; but when the facts appeared in their real significance it was too late to draw back. Only last year the vine question in Languedoc, known as the 'Crise du Midi,' was not wholly unconnected with the centralisation of Government, the old grievance of the South.'

The personages with whom Mr. Wilkinson chiefly deals are the two La Valettes (one of whom survived Henri IV), Charles Emmanuel of Savoy, Henri de Montmorency, and the young Duke of Guise; but the hero is the second La Valette, Epéron. The writer shews how the War of the League gradually spread ruin over all Provence, the only places exempt being those which had held out for the king or were inaccessible to troops, and the great strongholds of Aix and Marseilles. As a political study the monograph is singularly satisfying and complete, while the documents are full of extremely quaint and interesting details, illustrating religious history and Renaissance feeling as well as constitutional and military action. Mr. Wilkinson's work is a very valuable piece of entirely original contribution to our knowledge of the 'sources' for the history of the Wars of Religion.

*L'Église et la Sorcellerie.* Par J. FRANÇAIS. 'Bibliothèque de Critique Religieuse.' (Paris: Émile Nourry. 1910.) 3 fr. 50c.

'THE man of the Middle Ages,' says M. Français, 'had ever a demon at his elbow'; lived, in fact, on familiar and often quite friendly terms with him. With this, as with a great deal of the author's first statement of his thesis, we can thoroughly agree. The 'lubber-fiend' of Milton, the Robin Goodfellow of Shakespeare, the 'fairies' of every age and clime, provide us with examples extending far beyond the Middle Ages of this curious

relationship, which degenerated at one time into horrible forms of superstition and into vile sins intended and desired if not actually compassed.

The early Christians, says M. Français, by no means disbelieved in the gods of their heathen enemies ; on the contrary, they believed in and feared them as actual devils and as powerful for harm. But with this idea came also, at least for the ignorant and uninstructed, a belief in the innumerable beneficent spirits of flood and field which paganism had created. Ages of black misery transformed this trust in the helpfulness of such beings into a dark reliance on their powers of assisting men to do evil to one another ; and hence came the belief in sorcery—the employment of unholy agencies both for relief from straits and for revenge on one's fellows. For a long time such belief was treated as a more or less harmless mania by the Church ; condemned and anathematized as what it was—an insane fancy, not yet bad enough in its consequence to be treated as a heresy. But popular prejudice—which was after all the real heresy—demanded, in the hope of finding a scapegoat, the extirpation of those who were held to be, and who declared themselves to be, the agents of evil ; and the Church yielded. From the time of John XXII (1316–1334) onward, we find a succession of persecutions directed against the armies of sorcerers who were supposed to be desolating all countries. The culminating point was reached when the bull *Summis Desiderantes* of Innocent VIII (1494) systematized what had already become a code of judicial murder, and inaugurated a reign of terror which invaded every country of Europe, left whole principalities mere 'smoking places of execution,' and more than decimated their inhabitants.<sup>1</sup>

Up to this point we follow M. Français. The Church did yield to popular clamour. It was no doubt the alleged sorceries of Enguerrand de Marigny and his friends, directed against the life of King Louis Hutin, which induced the Pope (already an Avignon Pope, it must be remembered) to issue his sweeping decrees against the supposed battalions of maleficent agents ; but the idea of sorcery as 'heresy' no doubt came to the fore. When John XXII allowed the prosecution of an archbishop and the actual burning of a bishop as having dealings with the devil, he at least shewed his sincerity.

But when M. Français seeks to prove that the persecution was all the work of Churchmen, and that they were throughout

<sup>1</sup> C.Q.R., January 1904.

opposed by enlightened lawyers and physicians, we part company. According to his own shewing the three most cruel and relentless persecutors in France were three juris-consults of great repute. Nicolas Remy, the procureur-général in Lorraine, murdered 900 folk between 1595 and 1606. Henri Boquet, a lawyer of the first rank, counted his victims by hundreds in the 'Free County' of Burgundy about the same time, assisted by the Inquisition, which, as the land was Spanish territory, still held sway there. Pierre de Lancre, one of the earliest authorities on fossils and their origin, sent the people of Bordeaux to the stake, and when a beggar girl told him that a witches' Sabbath had been held in his own chamber dared not deny it. All these enlightened persons published books, not in defence, but in glorification of their own acts; and to theirs must be added the name of the great Bodin, the father of the 'Philosophy of History.' It was the learned pedant James I, and not the Church, who started the witch mania in England. It was the Parliament of Normandy—all lawyers—who as late as 1670, when Louis XIV had confirmed the appeal of thirty-four poor wretches condemned to death for sorcery, solemnly adjured the king to reconsider his ill-advised clemency. As to the physicians, M. François himself quotes their names: Plater, Sennert, Willis; men of all nations, all convinced of the reality of sorcery. Indeed, the very last judicial execution for witchcraft in civilized Europe took place at Glarus in June 1782 at the instance of a doctor, one Tschudi, who accused his poor maidservant of having bewitched his daughter.

In truth, when M. François heads one of his paragraphs, 'Le recul des théologiens devant les médecins et les juristes,' he might almost have reversed the title. The great Cornelius Agrippa had indeed at risk of his life made a noble protest against the mania and its attendant cruelties in the early days of the *Malleus Maleficarum*; but who followed in his train? A single disciple of his own, John Wier; and him the illustrious Bodin would forthwith have had burned for his pains. No, strangely enough, it was that very order of Jesuits whose representative, Del Rio, had systematized the awful code of judicial murder that compassed its downfall. The heroic Friedrich von Spee, Adam Tanner, and half a dozen others of the Society were the true destroyers of the monstrous thing. They were persecuted, no doubt, for they were opposing the fixed prejudice of ninety-nine men out of a hundred; but they did the work, and



the Lutherans, who had been as savage persecutors as any, followed them, and followed them zealously and successfully; but the overthrow of the criminal process against sorcery was not the work of lawyers and doctors as against the Church.

As a matter of fact, the mania was all but universal. The blindness of the judges was no doubt as great as the suicidal folly of the accused. But indeed these latter, once brought to trial, were already doomed. The rules of investigation were such as precluded any possible escape. Confession extracted under torture was regarded as equivalent to the testimony of an independent witness. The imprisonment which invariably followed accusation was of a kind sufficient in itself to induce mania, and the whole system was constructed not for the discovery of truth, but for the extirpation of the alleged sorcerers.

M. Français has written a lucid, an interesting, and a superficial book. That he should draw most of his illustrations from French records was of course to be expected; but he shews little acquaintance with the history of sorcery outside his own country. In his earlier pages the authorities which he quotes are recondite: in his second part he acknowledges that he relies almost entirely on Lea's *Inquisition* and Baissac's *Grands Jours de la Sorcellerie*; but in his later chapters there is every mark of hurried and incomplete work. The writer who quotes Spee's classical work, the *Cautio Criminalis*, at second hand (p. 199) lays himself open to strong criticism, and on p. 202 M. Français attributes to the good Jesuit a statement (unquotable here) which is at the most implied. One would be glad to know also on what authority it is stated that John Philip von Schönborn, already an ecclesiastic of high consideration, and the future primate of Germany, had to flee from Würzburg 'to escape death' on account of his disgust at the sorcery trials (p. 165). The history of sorcery has yet to be written. The writer must be, as M. Français remarks, 'à la fois historien, théologien, juriste, et médecin'; but above all he must be impartial.

#### V.—POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

- I. *Administrative Problems of British India*. By JOSEPH CHAILLEY, Member of the French Chamber of Deputies. Translated by Sir W. MEYER, K.C.I.E. (Macmillan and Co. 1910.) 10s.

2. *Indian Speeches.* By VISCOUNT MORLEY, O.M. (Macmillan and Co. 1909.) 5s.
3. *The Gates of India.* By Colonel Sir THOMAS HOLDICH, K.C.M.G. (Macmillan and Co. 1910.) 10s.
4. *The Present Situation in India.* By S. KAILASAM AIYAR, B.A. (Watts and Co. 1909.) 6d.

OF the works under review the most important is the careful and comprehensive study of M. Chailley—the fruit, as he tells us, of twenty years of thought, and ten of actual labour. For his facts and figures the author is greatly indebted to the collaboration of Sir William Meyer, but his criticisms and conclusions are his own. When he touches on our faults and mistakes, we shall do well to ponder what he has to say; when he approves, we have reason to hope that we are making progress in the right way. The book is not for casual readers, but any public man who wishes to prepare himself for the discussion of Indian questions can hardly choose a more competent or a more dispassionate guide. In the first place, M. Chailley brings home to our minds the vast extent and the endless complexity of the problem we are attempting to solve. India is not a country like Italy, but a continent like Europe, and the men one would encounter in a journey from Calicut to Chittagong differ more widely than French and German, Scandinavian and Slav. And in the second place, M. Chailley provides us with what the English journalist in India often lacks: he indicates the true standard of comparison; in considering each branch of the administration he describes first the situation as we found it, and then proceeds to shew what we have made of it. He declines altogether to accept the argument of those politicians who contend that British rule has impoverished the people. Even in regions liable to famine he finds ‘better houses than formerly, more jewellery on the women and children.’ In the Punjab, for example, poverty was universal; the Sikh rulers took the whole profits of the land, British administrators ‘gave the land back to the people.’ At the same time M. Chailley holds that Lord Lawrence’s land policy was ‘premature,’ and he points out that the average peasant is apt to regard the demand for a fixed sum as ‘more hateful than robbery.’ Weighing praise against criticism, we perceive that there is more in the land-revenue question than meets the eye of the sympathetic member of Parliament who studies agriculture from the window of a railway carriage. As

to the capacity of the people to work out their own economic salvation M. Chailley is not sanguine; the soil, he says, is far from fertile, the energies of the cultivator are depressed. 'Slackness is the worst curse of the country.' Those who know the Indian peasant will hesitate at the word 'slackness'; the Jat or the Kunbi earns his modest profit of a few pence per diem, and has to live on it; his religion tells him to remain where he is, and to do as his father did before him. In a short notice we cannot attempt to give any account of the author's review of our legislation, our educational policy, our police methods: on these and on other aspects of Indian life his lucid exposition will be most appreciated by those who have been most deeply immersed in the detail of administrative business.

Lord Morley has collected, in the volume under review, a 'small sheaf of speeches' setting forth the 'just, prudent, and necessary points and considerations' which have guided him in carrying out recent measures of reform. As everybody knows, his prudence has exposed him to much censorious criticism from his own political allies, and the purpose of this little book is, at least in part, defensive. With questions of party politics we are not here concerned, but we may all listen with respect and sympathy to the reflections of a highminded statesman, who is learning by experience that the formulae of academic liberalism cannot readily be adapted to the facts of Indian life. When the strain of his present duties is relaxed, Lord Morley may perhaps find time to tell us whether the formulae themselves stand out as clearly in his mind as they did in the editorial period of his career. In the meantime we welcome and value his authoritative account of the 'signal transaction' in which Lord Minto's administration has been engaged.

Sir Thomas Holdich is a survey officer of great distinction, and his previous works have led us to expect that he will use the latest topographical information to throw light on the problems of ancient history. A considerable portion of the work now published is devoted to the adventures of Alexander the Great; if any of our readers have laboured to reduce the classical narratives to consistency and precision, they will find it very profitable to go over the ground once more, in company with a writer who knows as much as one man may know of the debateable lands through which Alexander made his way to the Indus. We do not profess to agree with all the author's identifications of sites and tribes; to accept any identification as final would

be to close one of the favourite playgrounds of archaeologists and linguists. But Sir Thomas Holdich has made a solid addition to the list of books worth consulting when the land-frontier of India is in question.

Mr. Kailasam Aiyar is a graduate of an Indian University, and we give him credit for wishing to write something that will be of use to his countrymen. But his pamphlet affords a pathetic illustration of M. Chailley's statement that in historical criticism the writers of the Congress party are 'lamentably weak.' On every page we encounter old misrepresentations which have been corrected and exposed again and again. It is truly disheartening to find an educated Indian repeating the monstrous fiction that the Government takes 'half the gross produce' in land revenue. It is all the more disheartening because the writer evidently wishes to be fair: of this he gives an odd proof by publishing his own speculations with the marginal notes of his friend Mr. J. B. Pennington, who knows what he is writing about. The result is both amusing and instructive; but we trust that Mr. Kailasam Aiyar will shew us that he can produce better work than this.

1. *Socialism in Church History*. By CONRAD NOEL. (London: Frank Palmer. 1910.) 5s.
2. *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity*. By W. E. CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc. (Longmans. 1910.) 5s.
3. *The Social Principles of the Gospel*. By W. E. CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc. (S.P.C.K. 1909.) 1s. 6d.
4. *The Clergy and Social Service*. By the Very Rev. W. MOORE EDE, D.D., Dean of Worcester. (Edward Arnold. 1909.)
5. *The Working Faith of a Social Reformer*. By HENRY JONES, LL.D., D.Litt. (Macmillan and Co. 1910.) 7s. 6d.

If we are all socialists we can take our socialism in very different ways. Some people like concentrated essence of economic socialism forced by hydraulic pressure into a specially prepared Catholicism. Some prefer a tincture of socialism in a weak solution of 'Church.' Others, again, prefer a highly refined extract obtained by their own process from Philosophy. The important point is that both Christianity and Philosophy do, when not sterilized, yield on analysis a proportion of recognizable socialism. The author of *Socialism in Church History* would be more convincing if he applied the forcing process with less vehemence and to a less drastically prepared neo-anglicanism. The coining of the words



'Christo-capitalism' and 'Christo-atheist'—a terrible responsibility—is characteristic of his methods. In his zeal to purify Christianity from individualism he scornfully rejects Dr. Pusey as an exponent of Catholicism, not because he is too Roman, but because he is too 'introspective.' He finds in F. D. Maurice not a great Broad churchman, but a great Catholic; and, strangest of all, he sees in George Meredith's treatment of marriage the hand of 'the most Catholic of modern novelists.'

In like manner, for him, 'Righteousness' must be re-translated 'Justice'; and the word 'social,' as applied to the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, slips easily into 'socialistic.' His welcome of the suggestion of 'modern critics' that the fifty-first Psalm, 'so long supposed to be a Davidic poem of personal repentance, is the wail of the nation in captivity, with the walls of its city razed to the ground,' is an almost heroic instance of consistent obsession; for it means the light-hearted acceptance of the shattering discovery that the soul of man has for thousands of years uttered its most uplifting thought and deepest yearning in words which are only accidentally applicable and achieve their exquisite expression only by being grossly misunderstood. The book is not, however, to be judged entirely by its exuberances. Under these there lies a serious and serviceable attempt to dispel the illusion that modern social and industrial conditions are rooted in history, sacred or profane, and to shew that they are accidents rather than attributes of civilization, and in essential particulars alien to the spirit as well as to the letter of Catholic Christianity. On the other hand, there lies still deeper—so deep, indeed, as to be probably concealed from the author—a view of the comparative importance of the first and second commandments and of the personal and social elements in religion, which is perilously near to a mere Comtist worship of Humanity. From that point of view, as the late Dr. Edward Caird has well put it, 'Monotheism was the necessary basis of that wider society which binds men to each other simply as men. But when the sciences of sociology and morals arise, this external scaffolding ceases to be necessary and must even become injurious, for by reducing this world into a secondary position and subordinating its concerns to those of another world, Theology tended to dissolve rather than to knit closer the bonds of society.'

'It is worth while for us to notice that here, as always, between genuine Christianity and perfect common sense—another term for practical wisdom—there is absolute agreement.' Such is the

essence of Dr. Chadwick's social gospel, and it is strange to find him and the Dean of Worcester building this sort of complacent British 'House of Life' on the spiritual foundations of Bishop Westcott. It is only by eliminating the problems which have made the Cross seem foolishness to so many thinkers that religion can be stated in terms of common sense—only under the limitations of a British mind and temperament that it can be regarded as the mere sanctification of the British character. The Dean has, perhaps, more faith than Dr. Chadwick in what he calls a 'jocular quip,' but the resemblance of point of view between the two writers is unfortunately echoed in a looseness of style hardly to be expected in a Dean. If Dr. Chadwick has, within five pages, two such sentences as, 'This must be interpreted as the personal responsibility of each to see that he in his capacity does all in his power to see that the community discharges its responsibilities,' etc.—and, 'The poor in England might have been better off than what they are to-day'—and again on a later page, 'A far more moral course . . . than is the action of the official rulers and than what obedience to these would be'; Dr. Moore Ede can write, 'Co-operative Societies, instead of aiming at the inauguration of more righteous relations between buyer and seller, and in the relations of capital and labour, become,' etc.—and, 'every thoughtful clergyman . . . cannot escape from a consideration of the problem of poverty'; and if Dr. Chadwick leaves 'irrefragible' uncorrected in his proofs, the Dean is equally indulgent to 'the civitatis Dei' and 'cor nostrum in quietum.' Within their limits, however, the writers of this school have much to tell us which, if a little obvious, is sound so far as it goes. Both, for instance, have wise things to say about the need of study and discipline for those who would undertake philanthropic work, and Dr. Moore Ede is well informed about co-operation, friendly societies, and other 'agencies outside the church,' while Dr. Chadwick has a firm grip on the need of a tolerable environment as a condition of the family life and wholesome childhood which are essential to social well-being. To those whose motto is, 'Tush, He's a good fellow and 'twill all be well,' these may well seem useful, adequate, and even inspiring guides.

The Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, as might be expected from his previous work, goes straight for a root-problem. Do individualism and socialism admit of a true synthesis and, if so, on what lines is it to be sought?

Admitting, on the one hand, that the state, and even the human race, is in a real sense organic, and, on the other, that the limbs—or rather the very cells of that organism—are self-conscious and endowed with free will, is it necessary that either the part must be sacrificed to the whole or the whole to the part? His answer is that in the ideal organism the best for the whole is the best for the parts. It is the misguided self, the misconceived individuality—dreaming of an impossible isolation—that must be ‘denied.’ The false self of fallen humanity must die only that the true self, the new creature, may have that ‘more abundant’ life which is attained, not in spite of, but through and by means of its solidarity. We must recast our whole idea of the self to find its realization in that which we mistook for its negation. The biological formula of ‘struggle for existence’ and ‘survival of the fittest,’ and, in a less degree, the economic law of ‘competition’ are inadequate just because man is capable of consciously finding himself in the social organism: ‘In the purely economic state neighbours would tolerate one another, but each would find his end in himself.’ But the way of the spirit—the way of self-consciousness—is neither to subdue others to self nor self to others, but—as in wedded and family life—to ‘perform the feat’ of concurrent realization of self and not-self, of the good that is personal and the good that is common. And thus, and thus alone, can and must all life be made ethical.

In his fourth chapter on ‘The Coming of Socialism’ Professor Jones applies this principle to the idea of personal property; and in his fifth, ‘The Moral Aspect of the Fiscal Question,’ he pleads for its extension to international relations, and adopts the view, familiar to readers of *The Commonwealth*, that Protection is, at bottom, non-moral and, therefore, immoral.

It would have been interesting to those who have an open mind even on this most perplexing problem, to have from him some discussion of another possible view of the ethics of the question. If it is immoral to buy from the sweater for the mere sake of cheapness, is it quite clear that an international system of buying in the cheapest market, regardless of such considerations as the standard of life and wage in the producing country and the legitimacy of all the means of competition resorted to, is ethically beyond suspicion or reproach? But let us be thankful for a book that takes high ground, even on burning questions, and sets us thinking on right lines, clear of false metaphors and unsifted hypotheses.

## VI.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

*The Iphigenia in Tauris of Euripides.* Translated into English Rhyming Verse with Explanatory Notes. By GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.LITT., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford. (George Allen and Sons.) 2s.

WE welcome most warmly one more of Professor Murray's translations of Euripides, for indeed they *are* a benefit to the English reading public. We have much enjoyed already five of his plays of Euripides, and this last one in no way falls short of those already published. When a scholar of the high merit of Professor Murray has, also united, the gift of so excellent an English style and so great a power of rhyming, we may indeed be thankful that his vocation led him to translate 'The Athenian Drama.'

In a very interesting Preface Professor Murray gives us an account of the *Iphigenia in Tauris*. 'As usual,' he says, 'in Euripides, the central character of this play is a woman,' and, we may say perhaps, the most interesting woman ever portrayed in Greek Drama. We do not forget the 'Medea.' We had the pleasure, some three years ago, of seeing Professor Murray's version produced on the stage, and very excellent it was. We have a hope we may also see some day the 'Iphigenia.' What a charming scene would that on p. 63 make, when Iphigenia goes from one to another of the captive Greek women embracing them, and saying :

'O women, you my comrades, in your eyes  
I look to read my fate. . . .

—Are we not women, you and I,  
A broken race, to one another true,  
And strong in our shared secrets? Help me through  
This strait; keep hid the secret of our flight,  
And share our peril! Honour shineth bright  
On her whose lips are steadfast.'

We could quote endlessly, for in this excellent translation there are both beautiful passages and strong lines. It is in the lyrics, we think, that Professor Murray is most successful, both from the point of reproducing Euripides and of that of English verse :

'O Spirit, thou unknown,  
Who bearest on dark wings  
My brother, my one, mine own,  
I bear drink-offerings,  
And the cup that bringeth ease  
Flowing through Earth's deep breast;



Milk of the mountain kine,  
The hallowed gleam of wine,  
The toil of murmuring bees :  
By these shall the dead have rest.'

Both to those who understand and read the Greek language, and to those who do not, this play will be a true delight. We read in it of so many people of whose fate we wish to know, and what happiness it is to hear that, after all, Iphigenia was *not* sacrificed. Would we could know the same of Jephthah's daughter ! We would recommend our readers to get this play and to read it right through aloud. We have done so, and it gave us much pleasure, and the real feeling of a Greek Play.

*Essays on Greek Literature.* By R. Y. TYRRELL, LITT.D., D.C.L., F.B.A., Fellow of Trinity College, and formerly Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. (Macmillan and Co.) 4s. net.

PROFESSOR TYRRELL tells us that he 'harboured for many years the project of producing these five Essays on Greek together with others on Latin and English Literature'; but that he has been advised on good authority that such a collection would be incongruous and unacceptable. He had 'thought of endeavouring to bring the studies more up-to-date : but in some cases there seemed little to add, and in others such an attempt would have run counter to the original design.'

We have found these essays very pleasant reading, and withal instructive. They deal with subjects interesting both to scholars and to would-be scholars, relating of Pindar, Sophocles, and Plutarch, as well as of the newly-discovered Papyri, and the 'Poems of Bacchylides.' We think the most interesting essay is that on 'Bacchylides.' This may be partly because the topic is so much less well-known and well-worn than are the subjects of the other essays. It is a clear and lucid account of the work so ably edited by Dr. Kenyon. There are many, we think, who have not had sufficient time or opportunity to study these matters of scholarship, who will feel grateful to Dr. Tyrrell for giving them in these essays so short and good an account of this interesting work. The essay on Plutarch pleases us least ; but we find much literary merit in the essays both on Pindar and Sophocles. The comparison of Sophocles to modern writers, and their criticism of Pindar, which is given, will be interesting

to many. Of Dr. Tyrrell's scholarship we need not speak: it is well known. But we do object to his speaking of our old friend, the 'Riddle of the Sphinx,' as being 'redolent of the nursery.' We cannot agree to there being 'some dross of triviality' in a story which has been a delight to so many, old as well as young.

*A History of English Poetry.* By W. J. COURTHOPE, C.B. Vol. VI. (Macmillan. 1910.) 10s. net.

'If my narrative has enabled any reader to conceive more distinctly the gradual and majestic growth of the British Empire out of the institutions of the Middle Ages . . . these pages will not have been written in vain.'

These words, with which Mr. Courthope ends his long task, are a somewhat remarkable finale to a history of English poetry. The ordinary reader of poetry does not generally think of it primarily in relation to the British Empire, nor does he regard the prime purpose of a history of it as being to illustrate the development of that Empire. Nevertheless it is not the accident of a peroration, nor a desire to wave the Union Jack, that makes Mr. Courthope end on this note. On the contrary, it is characteristic of his point of view throughout his work. He treats poetry less as an expression of the human imagination than as a function of national life; and it is necessary to keep this fundamental postulate in mind if injustice is not to be done to the author. The average reader can hardly help accusing Mr. Courthope of coldness in his treatment of many of those poets who stand highest in common estimation to-day, notably (to take instances from the present volume alone) Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats. His preference is for Dryden and Pope and Goldsmith; and he even seems to write with more zest of Canning and Frere and the forgotten satirist Mathias, than of the authors of *Prometheus Unbound* and the *Ode on Immortality*. But this apparent perversity or insensibility arises from his point of view. Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats cut themselves off from the social and political life of their day to contemplate leechgatherers in Westmorland or fantastic fictions in a world of the imagination; while Dryden and Pope were in close contact with, and in great measure reflect, the best and most cultivated society of their time.

Mr. Courthope deserves credit for the steadiness with which he has carried through what we fear must be regarded as an unpopular undertaking; for the politicians and social leaders will not read histories of poetry in six solid volumes, and the lovers of

poetry will be repelled by the unsympathetic treatment of their favourites and the chilly atmosphere of the whole work. The preference of the day is for what Mr. Courthope classes as the Romantic school of poetry, while his own leaning is to the classical school. The Romantic school is Teutonic and mediæval ; the classical school derives from the civic spirit of Greece and Rome. The latter draws its life-blood from the public life of the nation ; the former tends to the separation of poetry from the organized course of national life and action. Hence Mr. Courthope, looking at poetry from the point of view of a student of national life, prefers the classical school ; while the majority of readers and critics, looking at poetry as an expression of the imagination and genius of the individual, attach themselves to the Romantics. It is perhaps hardly fair to say that it is a case of *Kubla Khan* on the one side and the *Needy Knife-grinder* on the other ; but there is an element of truth in the contrast.

Mr. Courthope closes his history with the end of the Georgian period, whereby he has two advantages. He is not called on to classify and criticize the poets of yesterday and to-day, with regard to whom feeling runs too high for sober history ; and he is able to end with an author who commands respect and admiration from critics of the most diverse schools. Scott was a Romantic of the Romantics ; nevertheless his sterling good sense, his firm grasp of contemporary life, and (shall we add ?) his strong Conservatism in politics command Mr. Courthope's allegiance, and none but a curmudgeon could help loving him for his personal goodness, his universal charity, his unspoilt goodwill in prosperity, his noble courage in adversity. An analysis of the *Waverley Novels* is perhaps not very relevant in a history of poetry ; but no one will grudge Mr. Courthope this enjoyment.

We congratulate Mr. Courthope unreservedly on the successful completion of the task which he took up some twenty years ago. There are other types of literary history, each useful in its own way. There is the bibliographical history, to which we turn, as a book of reference, when we need minute facts and dates with regard to poets and their works ; there are biographical histories, which aim at bringing out the personalities and the characters of poets ; and there are histories which treat of poetry as a function of the human soul. Mr. Courthope's history is of a different type from these, but one equally legitimate ; and it deserves an honourable place among the records of English literature and the achievements of the English people.

*The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A., and A. R. WALLER, M.A. Vol. IV. *Prose and Poetry: Sir Thomas North to Michael Drayton.* (Cambridge University Press. 1910.) 9s. net.

THIS contribution to the great Cambridge work is an adequate treatment of such portions as fall within its scope of the prose and poetry of the most glorious period of our literature. The drama is to be dealt with in Volumes V and VI, and is so rigidly excluded from the present volume that some of the most precious lyrics of this period are not allowed to take their proper place in an account which cannot be complete without them. The omission necessarily dims the glory of the wonderful outburst of song to which we look back so proudly, and it must be frankly acknowledged that, able as are the separate chapters which compose this volume, they fail to present the reader with the history, properly so called, which he is entitled to expect. It may be contended that a continuous thread of history, and the exposition of cause and effect, cannot be forthcoming in a work by so many different contributors, each specializing in his particular province. But at least the chapters might have been arranged to present a semblance of continuity, and an introductory chapter of general review, or a summary to the same effect, would have been a most valuable addition for the student who approaches the work without considerable general knowledge. As it is, the reader who has not this qualification is likely to be bewildered; but for one who already has made himself well acquainted with the period, there is a surpassing store of profit and delight. In the following remarks the chapters will be dealt with in what seems their natural order.

Mr. Whibley begins the volume with the 'Translators,' and his very first words raise our expectations. 'The translators of Elizabeth's age pursued their craft in the spirit of bold adventure which animated Drake and Hawkins.' This sentence strikes the key-note of his theme, which he proceeds to develop, in the all too short space of twenty-five pages, with a brilliancy of handling and an intimate knowledge that carry us along with a fascination continually increasing, and bring us to the end with a regret that he had not the rest of the volume all to himself. We have to wait till Chapters IV and V for what would have come so suitably after Mr. Whibley,—the 'Literature of the Sea' and 'Seafaring and Travel.' Chapters VI-XI deal with the Song-books and Miscellanies, with Southwell, Daniel, Campion,



the so-called 'Successors of Spenser,' Drayton, and Donne. Mr. Child contributes Chapters VI, VII, and X, interesting and edifying his reader with his masterly knowledge of the subject and his able scholarship. He takes the Song-books and Miscellanies in VI, and should in this chapter have been allowed to add the lyrics of the drama; it is open to question whether sufficient interest can be found nowadays to justify the length of the Chapter X on Drayton. On the other hand, in a short chapter of some seven and a half pages, Mr. Vivian deals with Campion, his work being condensed into about three pages, which come perilously near being a descriptive catalogue; and yet is not Campion the greatest lyric artist of the period? The names of Professor Bensley, Professor Sorley, and Arch-deacon Cunningham are a sufficient guarantee for the chapters they severally write on their special subjects, and the last is followed by Professor Routh, to whom was entrusted 'London and the Development of Popular Literature.' This chapter is the longest in the volume, but it should have been broken up into two, each at least of length equal to the original. For this was just the place in which to describe the literary London of Queen Elizabeth's day, and to shew us the interesting details of the life of these men of many activities. It is very disappointing to find Bacon's *Essays*, Jonson's *Timber*, Earle and his *Micro-cosmographie*, all crowded together with the sketch of London, Hall's and Marston's Satires, and various other items of much less importance. We settle down at once, however, to perfect contentment and to great delight in Chapters XVII and XVIII, in which Mr. Aldis, with his expert, extensive knowledge, makes Gervase Markham and the Book Trade people live before us, as no other writer has yet made them do. In addition to the exceeding interest of the Book Trade chapter, the student has the opportunity of getting from it material for judging independently difficulties such as are presented by, for example, the T. T. dedication prefixed to Shakespeare's sonnets.

Three chapters are still left to speak of, *viz.* III, by Mrs. Creighton, on 'Sir Walter Raleigh'; XII, by Mr. Hutchinson, on 'The English Pulpit from Fisher to Donne'; II, by the American Professor A. S. Cook, on the 'Authorised Version and its Influence.' The student will be deeply grateful to Mrs. Creighton for her able and discriminating monograph on Raleigh. In less than fifteen pages we have a presentment of Raleigh and his times and a critical consideration of his literary work, enabling us to see the development of our prose literature in a way

denied to us in any other part of this volume. Besides this, Raleigh's connexion with Spenser is brought most vividly before us, sending us back to our Spenser studies with fresh interest, and the impressive words respecting Raleigh's complimentary sonnet to the 'Faerie Queene' will open up for many a student a path to new knowledge. Limitations of space forbid us to say more of the other two chapters than that they continue the history of the Elizabethan prose with all the suggestiveness and completeness that the most ardent student could desire.

*The Bridling of Pegasus : Prose Papers on Poetry.* By ALFRED AUSTIN, Poet Laureate. (Macmillan. 1910.) 7s. 6d. net.

THE title of this volume is not, as we at first supposed, intended to indicate that the Poet Laureate has on this occasion bridled the impetuous steed of his poetic imagination with the curb of prose. We gather from a prefatory note that his book is so called because it contains an enunciation of the principles upon which poetry should be composed and criticized. These principles are as follows: 'No verse which is unmusical or obscure can be regarded as poetry'; 'Imagination in Poetry, as distinguished from mere Fancy, is the transfiguring of the Real, or actual, into the Ideal'; and, 'if these conditions are complied with, the greatness of the poem depends on the greatness of the theme.' The deduction from these principles, stated in the first essay, is that the order of progression in poetic value is, beginning with the lowest, Descriptive Poetry, Lyrical Poetry, Reflective Poetry, and Epic or Dramatic Poetry.

Unfortunately no indication is given by which one can judge to what extent success in execution can compensate for inferiority in class. *Kubla Khan* is a lyric (or is it still worse, a descriptive poem?); but do these scales help one to weigh its merit against, say, Pye's *King Alfred*? The omnipresence of the Deity is presumably a greater theme than a Grecian urn; but how far does this consideration bring one towards a true comparison of Keats' poem with that of Mr. Robert Montgomery? We have no wish to deny to Mr. Austin the merit which he claims, of consistency in his canons of criticism; but consistency in lack of illuminativeness is no great recommendation to the reading public, and it is to be feared that few readers will find much illumination in these essays. Mr. Austin thinks Byron a greater poet than Wordsworth, and indeed the most considerable English poet since Milton. He deals with Dante's realistic treatment of

the ideal, and his poetic conception of Woman, in two papers which are little more than strings of citations of well-known passages. He deprecates pessimism in poetry. He defends 'Mr.' Tennyson's poetry against both the praise and the blame of 'Mr.' Swinburne, and is far from sharing the latter's enthusiasm for M. Victor Hugo. He considers that a poet is much the better for some experience of practical affairs, and (if the final 'Conversation with Shakespeare in the Elysian Fields' has any meaning, we suppose it is this) he is indifferent to a knighthood in life or burial in Westminster Abbey after death. These are the main opinions set forth in the pages before us.

There is one advantage about a volume of poetical criticism in which (as here) passages from the poets criticized are quoted somewhat freely, in that you can, if you like, skip the criticism and read the poetry as you would read an anthology. Readers of Mr. Austin's volume will find not a little fine poetry, some criticisms with which they agree, and others with which they will probably not agree. What they will not find, we fear, is the stimulus and illumination which come from inspired and sympathetic criticism. One merit, however, no fair-minded reader will deny to its writer. He thinks nobly of poetry and truly reverences the great masters of the art.

#### PERIODICALS.

*The Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. XI. No. 43. April 1910. Frowde). Sir H. H. Howorth: 'The Influence of St. Jerome on the Canon of the Western Church,' II. C. Knetes: 'Ordination and Matrimony in the Eastern Orthodox Church,' I. C. H. Turner: 'A Critical Text of the *Quicumque Vult*.' F. C. Burkitt: 'The Peraean Ministry. A Reply.' To the Bishop of Barrow (J.T.S. Jan.). C. J. Ball: 'Psalm lxviii. *Exurgat Deus*.' C. F. Burney: 'Old Testament Notes.' F. C. Burkitt: 'St. Augustine's Bible and the *Itala*.' M. R. James: 'An Ancient English List of the Seventy Disciples.' F. C. Burkitt: 'H. v. Soden *Das lateinische N. T. in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*.' M. R. James: 'Webb Joannis Saresburiensis *Policratici Libri viii*.' J. Oman: 'J. K. Mozley *Ritschlianism*' and 'Edghill *Faith and Fact*.'

*The Hibbert Journal* (Vol. VIII. No. 3. April 1910. Williams and Norgate). A. Loisy: 'Remarques sur le Volume *Jésus ou le Christ*.' With English translation. J. A. Thomson: 'The Three Voices of Nature.' (Murtle Lecture, Aberdeen, 1909). M. E. Sadler: 'The Two-Mindedness of England.' H. Jones: 'The Ethical Demand of the Present Political Situation.' Right Hon. G. Balfour: 'Psychical Research and Current Doctrines of Mind and Body.' V. D. Scudder: 'Christianity in the Socialist State.' "One who has suffered it": 'Concerning Imprisonment' (In Australia). V. (Lady) Welby: 'The Message of Paul to the Present Age.' W. Manning: 'The Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.' R. B. Perry: 'The Futility of Absolutism.' Ahmed Na'im Effendi, Eshref Edib Bey, and Isma'il Hakki Effendi: 'Moslem Sermons' [E.T.]. Preached in Constantinople. Discussions. F. Podmore: 'Lodge *The*

*Survival of Man.* Ll. J. M. Bebb: 'Zahn Introduction to the N.T.' J. W. Scott: 'Galloway Principles of Religious Development.' H. H. Joachim: 'A Wolf Spinoza's Short Treatise on God, Man, and his Well-Being.' J. Seth: 'Stalker The Ethic of Jesus.' A. Boutwood: 'Forsyth The Person and Place of Jesus Christ.' J. M. L. Thomas: 'Sturt The Idea of a Free Church.' G. G. Coulton: 'Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History,' I. and 'Abram Social England in the XVth Century.' G. Galloway: 'Allan The Advent of the Father.'

*The London Quarterly Review* (No. 226. April 1910. R. Culley). C. Kernahan: 'How to Defend England.' R. M. Pope: 'The Beginnings of Christianity in the Roman Empire.' D. G. Whitley: 'Dr. Sven Hedin's Exploration of Tibet.' C. R. Smith: 'The Christian Conventicle in the N.T.' W. A. Cornaly: 'Confucius and his Message.' A. Brown: 'Christ and Ceremonial.' E. Walker: 'An Ideal Physician.' W. T. Davison: 'Recent Christian Progress.' J. G. Tasker: 'Schiele Die Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart.' R. W. Moss: 'Westphal The Law and the Prophets' [E.T.]. H. Egerton: 'The New Realism.' 'Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, II.' 'Temple Dictionary of the Bible.' 'Fairbairn Studies in Religion and Theology.' 'Mozley Ritschlianism' and 'Edghill Faith and Fact' (laudatory). T. W. Davies Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. 'Ginsburg Isaiah in Hebrew.' 'Hort Epistle of St. James.' 'Lepin La Valeur Historique du IV<sup>e</sup> Évangile.' 'Bishop of Birmingham Orders and Unity.' 'Greenup and Moulton The New Testament in the R.V. with Fuller References.' 'Cambridge Modern History, VI.' 'J. F. Rhodes Historical Essays.' 'O. Cary History of Christianity in Japan.' (The late) F. Thompson St. Ignatius Loyola. 'St. Cyres Pascal.' 'Letters of J. M. Neale.' 'G. G. Findlay W. F. Moulton.' 'R. Y. Tyrrell Essays on Greek Literature.' 'J. T. Stoddart The New Socialism.'

*The Dublin Review* (Vol. CXLVI. No. 293. April 1910. Burns and Oates). R. Grey: 'The Centenary of Alfred de Musset.' F. McCullagh: 'Modernism in Islam.' (The late) F. Thompson: 'Orison-Tryst.' A Poem. J. B. Williams: 'The Truth about Cromwell's Massacre at Drogheda.' D. G. McChesney: 'Roger II and Frederick II. A Study of Kinship.' J. Brittan: 'Anglicanism Sixty Years Ago.' W. Ward: 'The People and the Populace.' R. H. Benson: 'A Catholic Colony. A Suggestion.' H. Belloc: '"The International," II. The Motive Force.' B. C. A. W[indle]: '(The late) C. L. Falkiner Essays relating to Ireland'; 'Poulton Darwin and the "Origin."' 'Bradley Dr. Johnson and Mrs. Thrale.' 'R. Davey The Nine Days' Queen' (Lady Jane Grey. Laudatory). 'Addleshaw Sir Philip Sidney' (critical). 'Reinach Orpheus.' 'Leith Memoirs of Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries.' 'Firth Last Years of the Protectorate.' 'U. Birch Anna van Schurman.' 'Raupert The Supreme Problem.' J. Chapman: 'Chronicle of Recent N.T. Works.'

*The Irish Theological Quarterly* (Vol. IV. No. 18. April 1910. Dublin: M. H. Gill). J. MacRory: 'Cambridge Biblical Essays.' T. Slater: 'Scruples.' H. Pope: 'The Mosaic Authorship of Deuteronomy.' D. Barry: 'Some Theories of Sacramental Operation.' P. Forde: 'Original Sin and Human Nature.' J. Slattery: 'The Sacrificial Idea.' P. Boylan: 'The N.T. and the Newly Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman Period.' J. MacRory: 'F. E. Spencer O.T. History'; 'Schwalm La Vie privée du Peuple Juif à l'Époque de Jésus-Christ.' J. M. Harty: 'Macken The Canonisation of Saints'; 'Catholic Encyclopaedia, VI.' J. MacCaffrey: 'E. H. Burton Bishop Challoner' (1691-1781); 'T. Hughes History of the Society of Jesus in N. America. Documents, I. 1-2'; 'Costello De Annatis Hiberniae' (1400-1535); 'Hellman Sedulius Scottus'; 'Rand Johannes Scottus.' P. J. Toner: 'C. Moore Prayers for the Faithful Departed' (3rd edit.); 'F. R. M. Hitchcock Present Controversy on Prayer' (laudatory). J. O'Neill: 'Remacle La Philosophie de S. S. Laurie.'



H. Bewerunge: 'Dom Guéranger, Abbé de Solesmes'; 'Wienmann *History of Church Music*.'

*The Interpreter* (Vol. VI. No. 3. April 1910. Simpkin, Marshall). E. L. Hicks: 'Did St. Paul write from Caesarea?' A. Menzies: 'The Jewish Synagogue and Missions.' A. L. Lilley: 'A Real Catholicism.' C. F. Burney: 'The Religious Value of the Early Narratives of Genesis.' W. L. Wardle: 'The Book of Joel.' 'Psychology and the Resurrection Appearances.' F. L. H. Millard: 'Samuel's Revenge.' O. C. Whitehouse: 'The Condition of Egypt and Western Asia, 1700-1200 B.C., II.' H. W. Hogg: 'Orientalia,' VII. H. Johnson: 'Jesus or Christ?'; 'Cambridge Biblical Essays.' 'Macleane Our Island Church.' 'J. M. Thompson *The Synoptic Gospels in Parallel Columns*.' 'Noel Socialism in Church History.' 'Tyrell Christianity at the Cross Roads.'

*The American Journal of Theology* (Vol. XIV. No. 2. April 1910. Chicago University Press). E. D. Burton: 'The Status of Christian Education in India.' B. B. Warfield, W. A. Brown, and G. B. Smith: 'The Task and Method of Systematic Theology.' S. J. Case: 'The Religion of Jesus.' A. Oosterheerdt: 'The Transcendence of God in its Relation to Freedom and Immortality.' F. A. Christie: 'The Transcendence of God. A Reply to Prof. Faulkner' (*A.J.T.* Jan.). G. H. Gilbert: 'G. A. Gordon *Religion and Miracle*' (9 pp.); 'R. Scott *The Pauline Epistles*.' P. Smith: 'Enders Luthers Briefwechsel' (11 volumes) and 'Currie *Letters of Luther*' (selected). E. Nestle: 'Brook and McLean *The O.T. in Greek*, I. 2'; 'H. St. J. Thackeray *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek*'; 'J. H. A. Hart *Ecclesiasticus—Greek Text of Cod. 218*.' L. W. Batten: 'Torrey *Ezra Studies*.' S. J. Case: 'Preuschen *Griech.-Deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T.*' A. W. Vernon: 'Picton *Man and the Bible*' and 'W. N. Clarke *Sixty Years with the Bible*.' J. W. Moncrief: 'Jordan and Labanca *The Study of Religion in the Italian Universities*.' J. Moffatt: 'E. D. Burton, J. M. P. Smith, and G. B. Smith *Biblical Ideas of Atonement*.' W. L. Walker *The Gospel of Reconciliation*'; and 'W. de W. Hyde *Sin and its Forgiveness*.' H. W. Wright: 'Frank *Modern Light on Immortality*'; and 'Eucken *The Problem of Human Life*' [E.T.]. C. A. Exley: 'Forsyth *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*.' H. G. Schaefer: 'Münsterberg *Psychotherapy*.' D. C. Macintosh: 'H. Jones *Idealism as a Practical Creed*.'

*The Princeton Theological Review* (Vol. VIII. No. 2. April 1910. Princeton University Press). C. W. Hodge: 'Modern Positive Theology' (53 pp.). C. R. Morey: 'The Origin of the Fish-Symbol.' W. P. Armstrong: 'The Resurrection of Jesus.' B. B. Warfield: 'Hastings *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, II.' ('Dr. Sanday does not hesitate to invent facts'!!); 'Piercy *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*' (critical); 'Birch *Anna van Schurman*'; 'A. L. Strong *The Psychology of Prayer*.' 'Bishop of Durham *Faith, Its Nature and Work*' ('A delightful little Book'). W. B. Greene, jr.: 'G. E. Dawson *The Child and His Religion*'; 'F. G. Peabody *The Approach to the Social Question*.' W. J. Beecher: 'New Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia*, V.' J. O. Boyd: 'D. B. MacDonald *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*'; 'Sihler *Testimonium Animae, or Greek and Roman before Jesus Christ*'; 'Köberle *Die Beziehungen zwischen Israel u. Babylonien*.' G. Vos: 'Martí *Religion of the O.T.*'; 'W. Caspari *Echtheit . . . der Messianischen Weissagung, Is. 9, 1-6*'; 'J. Boehmer *Gottes Angesicht*'; 'Denney *Jesus and the Gospel*' (7 pp.); 'Winstanley *Spirit in the N.T.*'; 'Fairweather *Background of the Gospels*'; 'König *Ahasver "der Ewige Jude"*.' J. G. Machen: 'Steinmann *Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes*' (defends North-Galatian theory); 'R. Scott *The Pauline Epistles*.' W. P. Armstrong: 'B. W. Bacon *The Fourth Gospel*' (8 pp.); 'Pick *Paralipomena and Apocryphal Acts of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew and Thomas*' (critical); 'Vedder *Our New Testament. How did we get it?*' (critical); 'Heer *Die Versio Latina des Barnabasbriefes*.' B. F. Paist: 'Vollmer

*Calvin.* C. W. Hodge: 'A. H. Strong *Systematic Theology*, III. *The Doctrine of Salvation.*'

*The Expositor* (N.S. Nos. 52-54. April-June 1910. Hodder and Stoughton). J. B. Mayor: 'Hort's Posthumous Commentary on St. James,' I (II. June). E. Griffith-Jones: 'Dr. Forsyth on the Atonement.' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Historical Commentary on 1 Timothy' (*continued*. Also May). E. von Dobschütz: 'The Eschatology of the Gospels. III. Two more Features in the Genuine Jesus-Tradition' (May. IV. 'Jesus'). S. R. Driver: 'The Method of Studying the Psalter. Psalm xl.' (June. 'Ps. xxii'). D. S. Margoliouth: 'Studies in the Sermon on the Mount. IV. The Lord's Prayer.' J. Orr: 'Sin as a Problem of To-day. IV. Sin in its Principle and Development' (June. V. 'Sin and Evolutionary Theory—The Issues'). May. J. B. McClellan: 'Colossians ii 18. A Criticism of the Revised Version.' H. R. Macintosh: 'Miracles and the Modern Christian Mind.' E. H. Askwith: 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel. IX. The Triumphal Entry, and the Last Supper' (June. X. 'The Probability of a Ministry in Jerusalem'). W. Emery Barnes: 'Nathan and David.' K. Lake: 'The Text of the Gospels.' W. L. Walker: 'Eucken and Christianity.' June. Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'A Martyr of the Third Century.' (Trophimus martyred at Synnada c. 276-282 A.D.). G. Margoliouth: 'Isaiah and Isaianic.' J. Rendel Harris: 'Athanasius and the Book of Testimonies.'

*The Expository Times* (Vol. XXI. Nos. 7-9. April-June 1910. T. and T. Clark). Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist,' II (III. May). J. Rendel Harris: 'Crete, the Jordan, and the Rhône.' W. W. Holdsworth: 'The Life of Faith. The Informing Spirit' (John xvi 1-15). R. Mackintosh: 'The Tone of Galatians ii 1-10.' J. Moffatt: '2 Thess. iii 14, 15.' J. Boehmer: 'The Cursing of the Fig-Tree.' M. L. Smith: 'James ii 8.' E. Nestle: (1) 'The *Sod Bible*'; (2) 'The First Female Martyr.' M. D. Gibson: 'John xi 43.' A. Condamin: 'The *Vulgate* of Prof. Henslow' (with Mr. Henslow's reply). J. B. Russell: 'Was the Baptist loyal to Jesus?' H. Bulcock: 'John xii 32-6.' J. K. Mozley *Ritschlianism* and Edghill *Faith and Fact*. Macauliffe *The Sikh Religion*. 'Books on the Atonement.' May. E. de Knevet: 'The German Excavations at Jericho.' 'The American Sermon.' (Reviews.) T. G. Pinches and F. Hommel: 'The Oldest Library in the World and the New Deluge Tablets.' T. H. Weir: 'The Election of Saul.' G. G. V. Stonehouse: 'Note on Micah i 26.' C. P. Sherman: '"A Reed shaken with the Wind"' (Matt. xi 7). R. Mackintosh: 'John v-x. Where were the disciples?' F. V. Pratt: 'Rev. xiv 13.' L. Köhler: 'Luke xi 41.' E. Nestle: (1) 'Acts xvii 39'; (2) 'The *Index Biblicus* of the *Vulgate*'; (3) 'Two Mistakes in the "Revised New Testament"' (in Mc. vi 25, Lc. xv 26). 'Savage *The Gospel of the Kingdom*.' 'Fleming *The Reformation in Scotland*.' 'A. H. Mathew *Life and Times of Hildebrand*.' J. Moffatt: 'Dieterich *Eine Mithras-Liturgie*.' June. F. Hommel: 'The Traditions of the Masai.' G. Margoliouth: 'The Use of Charms and Amulets in Ethiopia.' Ven. G. R. Wynne: 'Mercy and Truth.' J. S. Banks: 'The Disciples and Christ's Resurrection.' J. Geffcken: 'Character.' M. Joseph: 'The Place of Charity or Alms-giving in the O.T.' E. de Knevet: 'The German Excavations at Jericho' (correction). A. Thom: 'Christ's Necessities' (John iv 4). 'Christ and Civilization.' 'Schweitzer *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*.' 'Lawson *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*.' 'H. C. King *The Ethics of Jesus*.' 'Richter *History of Protestant Missions in the Near East*.'

*The Churchman* (N.S. Vol. XXIV. Nos. 52-54. April-June 1910. Stock). J. Orr and H. M. Wiener: 'Cambridge Biblical Essays.' A. W. Hutton: 'To Rome and Back,' I (II-III. May-June). A. Plummer: 'Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church,' I (II. June).

F. H. L. Millard : 'Some Advantages of Establishment.' G. G. Coulton : 'Anglo- and Roman Catholic Responsibility for Truth.' W. H. Griffith Thomas : 'Bishop Gore on the Ministry.' 'Chase Confirmation in the Apostolic Age' (critical). W. St. C. Tisdall : 'Oesterley The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation.' 'Gee The Reformation Period.' 'Jennings The Medieval Church and the Papacy.' May. Bishop of Durham : "'The Lord's Brother.'" Sermon at T. C. D., Feb. 13, 1910. F. W. O. Ward : 'Zeno the Stoic and St. Paul at Athens.' W. Cowan : 'John Bale, Bishop of Ossory.' W. St. C. Tisdall : 'The Modern Conception of God' (June. 'The Reality of the Christ of the N.T.'). G. G. Coulton : 'Flick The Rise of the Medieval Church.' W. St. C. Tisdall : 'Kent Heroes and Crises of Early Hebrew History.' 'Alford O. T. History and Literature.' 'J. G. Simpson Christus Crucifixus.' 'W. Temple The Faith and Modern Thought.' June. W. E. Chadwick : 'The Scientific Mind in Social Work.' A. R. Whately : 'Conversion and Modern Needs.' C. J. Sharp : 'Some Disadvantages of Establishment.' L. Preece : 'A Layman's View of the Church Services.' W. St. C. Tisdall : 'Westphal The Law and the Prophets' [E.T.]. 'Greenup and Moulton The N.T. with Fuller References.' 'Swete The Holy Spirit in the N.T.' 'R. J. Drummond Faith's Certainties.'

*The Catholic World* (Vol. XCI. Nos. 541-3. April-June 1910. New York). V. M. Crawford : 'A Champion and his Labors.' Mr. Hilaire Belloc. K. Brégy : 'Coventry Patmore.' L. O'Donovan : 'Catholics and Books,' I (II. May). W. H. Kent : 'Scholastic Logic and Modern Theology.' 'Wolfustan The Catholic Church in China, 1860-1907.' 'Birch Anna van Schurman' ('strangely uninteresting'). May. W. L. Campbell : 'H. G. Wells,' I (II. June). J. J. Burke : 'Publicity and Social Reform.' J. F. Fenlon : 'Methodist Pioneers in Italy.' 'J. A. Dewe Psychology of Politics and History.' 'The Documentary History of American Industrial Society' ('monumental'). June. W. H. Kent : 'Theology and Mathematics.' W. S. Lilly (edited by) : 'A Dying Man's Diary,' I. F. Bricout : 'S. Reinach Orpheus.' 'J. MacCaffrey History of the Catholic Church (1798-1908).' 'A. G. Morice History of the Catholic Church in W. Canada (1659-1895).' 'F. Klein L'Amérique de Demain.'

*The Edinburgh Review* (No. 432. April 1910. Longmans). 'English Waterways.' 'The Work of Reform. Mary Wollstonecraft—Caroline Norton.' 'The English Peasant.' 'Art and Practice.' 'A Century of Scottish Life.' 'Oliver Wendell Holmes—A Centenary Study.' 'Histories of the French Revolution.' 'Minoan Crete.' 'The Last Years of the Protectorate.'

*The Quarterly Review* (No. 423. April 1910. Murray). 'Society and Politics in the Nineteenth Century.' G. Lowthian Bell : 'A Palace in the Syrian Desert' (Illustrated). W. L. Jones : 'Early Welsh Poetry.' M. Fullerton : 'The Art of Henry James.' 'Socialism. I. Its Meaning and Origin.' 'The New Astronomy.' S. Lane-Poole : 'India in the Seventeenth Century.' E. Crammond : 'The Economic Position of Germany.' 'Greece and King George.' A. V. Dicey : 'The Referendum and its Critics.' 'Ancient and Modern Stoicism.'

*The English Historical Review* (Vol. XXV. No. 98. April 1910. Longmans). C. Perkins : 'The Knights Templars in the British Isles.' C. H. Jenkinson : 'The First Parliament of Edward I.' R. G. Marsden : 'Early Prize Jurisdiction and Prize Law in England,' II. R. B. Mowat : 'The Mission of Sir Thomas Roe to Vienna, 1641-2.' J. B. Bury : 'The Bulgarian Treaty of A.D. 814 and the Great Truce of Thrace.' J. H. Clapham : 'The Horsing of the Danes.' C. H. Haskins : 'A Canterbury Monk at Constantinople, c. 1090.' From Cqd. Vat. Lat. 4951. R. L. Poole : 'The Battle of Tenchebrai : a Correction.' With a revised Text from Jesus Coll. Oxon. MS. li. H. W. C. Davis : 'Henry of Blois and Brian Fitz-Count.' J. C. Fox : 'Marie de France.' Sir J. H. Ramsay, Bart. : 'Edward Balliol's Scottish Expedition in 1347.' B. H. Putnam :



'*Suete de Prisone*.' W. Miller: 'The Founder of Montenegro.' Stephen Crnojević. B. Jarrett: 'Bequests to the Black Friars of London during the XVth Century.' T. Nicklin: 'Cavaignac *Le Trésor d'Athènes de 480 à 404*.' A. Gardner: 'Gelzer *Byzantinische Kulturgeschichte*.' H. D. Hazeltine: 'Hyamson *History of the Jews in England*' and 'Henriques *The Jews and the English Law*.' W. P. Ker: 'Collingwood *Scandinavian Britain*.' C. C. J. Webb: 'Robert L'Enseignement de la Théologie (1100-1150).' H. Rashdall: '*Chartularium Studii Bononiensis*, I.' J. P. Gilson: 'A. G. Little *Tractatus fr. Thomae . . . de Eccleston de Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*.' W. H. Frere: 'Pierce *Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts*.' E. W. Watson: 'Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptists (1654-1811).' A. W. Ward: 'Birch Anna van Schurman.' A. L. Smith: 'Webb *English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act*.' (11 pp.). J. Tait: 'Vino-gradoff *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*.' H. Bradley: 'McClure *British Place-Names*.' A. G. Little: 'J. Armitage Robinson and M. R. James MSS. of *Westminster Abbey and Flete's History of Westminster Abbey*.' H. W. C. Davis: 'H. C. Maxwell Lyte *History of Dunster*.' F. M. P[owicke]: 'Krehbiel *The Interdict, its History and Operation*.' 'B. H. Putnam *The Enforcement of the Statute of Labourers, 1349-59*.' 'Pollen and Burton *Kirk's Biographies of English Catholics in the XVIIIth Century*.'

*The Economic Review* (Vol. XX. No. 2. April 1910. Rivingtons). R. Kenyon: 'Social Conditions and the Principles of 1834.' D. A. Barker: 'The Taxation of Salt in India.' F. W. Russell: 'Indian Land Tenure and the Manor.' J. L. Dougan: 'Legislation, Parliamentary Inquiries, and Official Returns.' J. C. Pringle: 'Hand-labour in Japan.' E. Lesser: 'A German Juvenile Labour Exchange.' At Hamburg. W. J. Ashley: 'Carlyle *Mediaeval Political Theory*, II.' R. L. Ottley: 'Chadwick *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity*' ('admirable'). D. Stone: 'J. M. Thompson *Jesus according to St. Mark*.' H. W. Wolff: '*La petite Propriété rurale en France*' (By the French Minister of Agriculture). E. P. Swain: 'E. T. Devine *Social Forces*.'

*The Contemporary Review* (Nos. 532-4. April-June 1910. Horace Marshall). M. C. J. Leith: 'The Boyhood of A. C. Swinburne.' E. J. Putnam: 'The Greek Lady.' (May. 'The Roman Lady.' June. 'The Lady Abbess'). U. Sinclair: 'Perfect Health' (Obtainable by Fasting). R. Roberts: 'Judgment and Justification.' M. R. James: 'The Stalls of Barchester.' (A gruesome tale by the Provost of King's.) J. Hammond: 'The Alleged Papal Charter. A Rejoinder.' C. Tennyson: 'The Libraries' Censorship.' "Museus": 'Easter and April.' Sir D. Pigott: 'H. W. Walker *Wanderings among South Sea Savages*.' W. Emery Barnes: 'Ginsburg *Isaiah*' (Hebrew Text). 'S. S. Smith *Dean Swift*.' 'R. N. Bain *The Last King of Poland*.' 'E. Elliott *The Growth of the American Union*.' 'J. Armitage Robinson and M. R. James MSS. of *Westminster Abbey and Flete's History of Westminster Abbey*.' 'E. Addleshaw *Sir Philip Sidney*.' 'Osler *Michael Servetus*.' 'Ritson *Abroad for the Bible Society*.' May. E. Gosse: 'Melchior de Vogüé.' P. H. Cowell: 'Halley's Comet.' H. F. Platt: 'An Early Champion of Christianity.' Minucius Felix. M. H. L. Bunting: 'Mistress and Maid.' Lajpat Rai: 'The Arya Samaj, its Aims and Teachings.' E. C. Dauncey: 'Ignorant Mothers.' 'Baring *Landmarks in Russian Literature*.' 'McTaggart *Hegel's Logic*.' 'Cecil *Changing China*.' 'A. H. Thompson *Sir John Suckling*.' 'Sichel *Sterne*.' June. J. N. Farquhar: 'The Greatness of Hinduism.' A. F. Tredgold: 'The Feeble-minded.' P. T. Forsyth: 'Calvinism and Capitalism, I.' 'Elliot and Taylor *Letters of J. S. Mill*.' 'Monod *Les Jesuites*.' 'Oman *England before the Conquest*.' 'Schweitzer *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*.' 'Haile *Reginald Pole*.' 'Medley *Original Illustrations of English Constitutional History*.'



*Revue Biblique Internationale* (N.S. Vol. VII. No. 2. April 1910. Paris: Lecoivre). A. Fabre: 'L'ange et le chandelier de l'Église d'Éphèse.' P. Dhorme: 'Les pays bibliques et l'Assyrie' (*suite*). A. Condamin: 'Les prédictions nouvelles du chapitre XLVIII d'Isaïe.' F. M. Abel: 'Une croisière sur la mer Morte' (*suite*). Illustrated. P. Dhorme: 'Les sources de la Chronique d'Eusèbe.' A. Jaussen: 'Coutumes des Arabes. Le gôz musarrib.' E. Tisserant: 'La version mozarabe de l'Épître aux Laodicéens.' H. Vincent: '(1) Une mosaïque byzantine à Bettir. (2) Timbres romains.' Illustrated. M. J. Lagrange: 'Stanton *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, II'; 'Hawkins *Horae Synopticae*'; 'Lepin *La Valeur historique du IV<sup>e</sup> Évangile*' (8 pp.). F. M. Abel: 'Von Soden *Das lateinische N.T. in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*.' H. Vincent: 'H. C. Butler *Ancient Architecture. North Syria*'; 'Prentice *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*.' A. Jaussen: 'Hartmann *Der islamische Orient*. II, *Der Islam. Geschichte-Glaube-Recht*'; 'Oppenheim *Inschriften aus Syrien*.' P. Dhorme: 'Joüon *Le Cantique des Cantiques*' (5 pp.); 'Egger *Absolute oder relative Wahrheit der hl. Schrift?*'; 'Holzhey *Fünfundsechzig Punkte zur Beantwortung der Frage "Absolute oder relative Wahrheit der hl. Schrift?"*'; 'Cambridge *Biblical Essays*'; 'Swete *The Holy Spirit in the N.T.*'; 'Mader *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*'; 'Alt *Israel u. Aegypten*'; 'Toffteen *The Historic Exodus*'; 'Caspari *Aufkommen u. Krise des israelitischen Königtums*'; 'Langdon *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*'; 'Carra de Vaux *La doctrine de l'Islam*'; 'Poussin *Bouddhisme*'; 'Louis *Doctrines religieuses des philosophes grecs*' (*laudatory*).

*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* (Vol. XV. No. 1. 1910. Paris: 20, rue du Regard). M. Brière: 'La Légende syriaque de Nestorius.' Syriac text and translation from an Urmi MS. 134 (A.D. 1558). L. Leroy: 'Histoire d'Abraham le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Alexandrie (texte arabe, traduction française).' II. S. Grébaut: 'La prière de Langinos (texte éthiopien, traduction française).' From MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. aeth. 31. F. Nau: 'Hagiographie Syriaque. S. Alexis. Jean et Paul. Daniel de Galas. Hannia. Euphémie. Sahda. Récits de Méléce sur le vendredi, sur Marc et Gaspar, et sur un homme riche qui perdit tous ses enfants, etc.' From MSS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. syr. 234-6. P. Dib: 'L'initiation chrétienne dans le rite maronite.' L. Delaporte: 'Catalogue sommaire des MSS. coptes de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris,' II. S. Pétrides: 'Le synaxaire de Marc d'Éphèse (introduction et texte grec).' MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. gr. 1295. F. Nau: 'Lepin *La Valeur historique du IV<sup>e</sup> Évangile*'; 'Delaporte *La Chronographie d'Élie bar-Sinaya de Nisibe*' (from MS. Brit. Mus. add. 7197); 'Decourdemanche *Traité pratique des poids et mesures des peuples anciens et des Arabes*.' M. Brière: 'Schwabens *La Vie privée du Peuple juif à l'Époque de Jésus-Christ*.'

*Analecta Bollandiana* (Tom. XXIX. Fasc. i-ii. 1910. Brussels. 22, Boulevard Saint-Michel). A. Poncelet: 'Le légendier de Pierre Calo.' (116 pp.). H. Delehaye: 'L'invention des reliques de Saint Ménas à Constantinople.' P. Peeters: 'S. Eleutherios-Guhistazad.' A. P[oncelet]: 'Gertz *Vitae Sanctorum Danorum*'; 'Lanzoni *"Liber Pontificalis" di Ravennate*'; 'Duprat *Les Origines de l'Église d'Avignon*'; 'Lindner *Monasticon metropolis Salzburgensis antiquae*'; 'Delisle *Rouleau mortuaire du B. Vital, abbé de Savigny*.' (Includes English notices, A.D. 1122-3). P. P[eters]: 'Balestri-Hyvernat *Acta martyrum*' (coptic); 'A. S. Lewis *Codex Climaci Rescriptus*.' H. D[elehaye]: 'Kehr *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, IV'; 'Wilpert *Die Papstgräber u. die Cäcilien-gruft in der Katakomba des hl. Kallistus*'; 'Winstedt *Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes*'; 'Tomassetti *La Compagna Romana*, I'; 'Schwartz *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte*, III'; 'Stählin *Clemens Alexandrinus*, III'; 'Tisserant *Ascension d'Isaïe*.' H. Moretus: 'Caspar *Petrus Diaconus u. die Monte Cassiner Fälschungen*'; 'Baring-Gould and

Fisher *Lives of the British Saints*, II.' [F.] V[an] O[r]troy: 'Michel Vie de S. François Xavier'; 'Susta Die Romische Curie u. das Concil von Trient'; 'Herre Papsttum u. Papstwahl im Zeitalter Philipps II.' U. Chevalier: 'Repertorium Hymnologicum. Supplementum alterum.'

*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Vol. XI. No. 2. April 1910. Louvain: 40, rue de Namur). J. Flamion: 'Les actes apocryphes de Pierre,' VI. L. Laurand: 'Le "Cursus" dans la légende de S. François par S. Bonaventure.' H. de Jongh: 'La faculté de théologie de l'université de Louvain au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle et au commencement du XVI<sup>e</sup>. Ses débuts, son organisation, son enseignement.' H. Coppieters: 'Chapman *Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*.' E. Tobac: 'Batiffol *L'Église naissante et le catholicisme*.' C. Mohlberg: 'Atchley *History of the Use of Incense in Divine Worship*.' F. Baix: 'Kehr *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, III-IV.' L. Van der Essen: 'Hartmann *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*, III. 1'; 'Quentin *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen âge*'; 'Koeniger *Quellen zur Geschichte der Sendgerichte in Deutschland*.' J. de Ghellinck: 'Gromer *Die Laienbeicht im Mittelalter*.' F. Callaey: 'Eubel *Bullarii Franciscani Epitome*.' A. A. Fierens: 'A. G. Little *Tractatus Thomae . . . de Eccleston de Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*.' H. de Jongh: 'Bossert *Johann Calvin*.' L. Willaert: 'Galante *L'efficacia del diritto canonico in Inghilterra*'; 'Galichet *L'Église anglicane et l'État*.' C. Terlinden: 'G. Goyau *L'Allemagne religieuse. La Catholicisme* (1800-70), III-IV' (26 pp.). J. J. Forget: 'Granderath *Histoire du concile du Vatican*, II.'

*Revue des Questions Historiques* (Vol. LXXXVII. No. 174. April 1910. Paris: 5, rue Saint-Simon). H. de Landosle: 'L'enlèvement du grand prieur de Vendôme (1710).' C. Bournisien: 'Conséquences économiques et sociales de la vente des bien nationaux' (*suite et fin*). P. Allard: 'Les philosophes scolastiques et l'esclavage.' F. Strowski: 'Sur Port-Royal et le jansénisme.' A. Lesort: 'Caillet *Les relations de la commune de Lyon avec Charles VII et Louis XI* (1417-83)'; 'Charavay-Vaesens-Mandrot *Lettres de Louis XI*, X.' R. Schneider: 'Ludwig-Molmenti *Vittore Carpaccio*.' L. Didier: 'Schuyler *Transition in Illinois from British to American Government*.' F. Cabrol: 'Hastings *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, I-II'; 'Gwatkin *Early Church History*'; 'Faussett *Novatiani de Trinitate Liber*'; 'Burton Bishop Challoner (1691-1781)'; 'Connolly *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*.' 'Bishop *The Bosworth Psalter*.' 'Franz *Die Kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter*' (a work of 1456 pp.). R. Hawke: 'The Catholic Record Society.' D. E. Bouvet: 'Carra de Vaux *La Doctrine de l'Islam*'; 'Pannier *Les Psaumes d'après l'hébreu*'; 'Prat *La Théologie de S. Paul*, I.' E. Mangenot: 'Kittel *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II' (2<sup>te</sup> Aufl.); 'Lepin *La Valeur historique du IV<sup>e</sup> Évangile*.' J. Zeiller: 'Dufourcq *Étude sur les Gesta martyrum romains*, IV.' J. Guiraud: 'Egidi *Necrologi . . . della provincia Romana*.' J. Viard: 'Hauser *Les sources de l'histoire de France* (1494-1610)'; 'Hérelle *Documents inédits sur le protestantisme à Vitry-le-François*, etc.' G. Baguenault de Puchesse: 'Blennerhasset *Marie Stuart* (1542-87)'; 'Wilkinson *Last Phase of the League in Provence*.' G. Gautherot: 'Bahler *Kulturbilder aus der Refugientenzeit in Bern* (1685-99).' M. de la Rochetier: 'Pisani *L'Église de Paris pendant la Révolution*.'

*Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* (N.S. Vol. I. No. 2. March-April 1910. Paris: É. Nourry). E. C. Babut: 'Paulin de Nole et Priscillien.' L. Coulange: 'L'idée messianique.' A. Loisy: 'Magie, science et religion.' A. Loisy: 'V. Henry *La Magie dans l'Inde antique*' (new edit.); 'Jaussen *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab*' ('très remarquable.' 4½ pp.); 'Gressmann *Altorientalische Texte u. Bilder zum A.T.*'; 'Toffteen *The Historic Exodus*'; 'Minocchi *La Genesi con discussioni critiche and Le Profezie d'Isaia*'; 'Herrmann *Ezekielstudien*'; 'Van Hoonacker *Les douze petits prophètes*.'

*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* (Vol. XXXIV. No. 2. 1910. Innsbruck). E. Michael: 'Baubetrieb in der romanischen Kunstperiode. Die Bauhütte.' F. Maurer: 'Arbeitslohn u. Honorar f. sündhafte Handlungen,' III. J. Biederlaek: 'Zur Frage von der sittlichen Erlaubtheit der Arbeiterausstände.' E. Dorsch: 'Aphorismen u. Erwägungen zur Beleuchtung des "vorirenäischen" Opferbegriffs,' II. J. Stiglmayr: 'Zu Joh. ii 1 ff.' C. A. Kneller: (1) 'Ein Zeugnis Ephraïms über das Fehlen von c. 1 u. 2 im Texte des Lukas.' (2) 'Theodor Abucara über Papsttum u. Konzilien.' P. Sinthern: 'Paschini *La Chiesa Aquilejense ed il periodo delle origini*.' Testi-Rasponi *Note marginali al "Liber Pontificalis" di Agnello Ravennate*. J. Müller: 'Jesus—ein Proletarier?' 'Venturi *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia*.' A. Kröss: 'Greving *Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien u. Texte*.' E. Michael: 'Franz Die Kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter.' J. Stuffer: 'Heinrichs *Die Genußungstheorie Anselms v. Canterbury*.' M. Flunk: 'Van Hoonacker *Les douze petits prophètes*.' J. Biederlaek: 'Cathrein *Die Frauenfrage*.' M. Führich: 'Scherer *Religion u. Ethos*.'

*Theologisch Tijdschrift* (N.S. Vol. II. No. 3. 1910. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh). J. A. Cramer: 'De berichten aangaande de Verschijningen van Jezus Christus.' F. Orlt: 'Vitalisme in het licht der Natuurwetenschap.' H. J. Groenewegen: 'Vit de jongste wijsgeerig theologische literatuur.' Reviews: 'Van Velzen *Systém des Religieën Materialismus*.' Bierens de Haan *De weg tot het in zicht*.' Bavinck *Wijsbegeerte der Openbaring*. H. Meyboom: 'W. Bauer *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der N.T. Apokryphen*.' 'Een medicus over de Wet van Mozes.'

*Teologisk Tidsskrift* (N.S. Vol. I. Nos. 2-4. Kjöbenhavn: G. E. C. Gad). L. J. Koch: 'Parsismens Indflydelse paa Jödedom og Kristendom.' A. T. Jörgensen: 'Lutherproblemes og den nyeste Lutherforskning,' I (No. 3. II). V. Lindegaard-Petersen: 'A. Houtin *Un prêtre marié, Charles Perraud (1831-92)*' (5 pp.). P. Severinsen: 'Nutzhorn *Den danske Menigheds Salmesang i Reformationstiden*,' No. 3. O. T. Jacobsen: 'Videnskaben og Jesu Liv.' P. Severinsen: 'Desideria liturgica,' I (No. 4. II). E. Rodhe: 'Svenskan Kyrkan år 1909.' H. Wellejus: 'Pfannmüller *Jesu im Urteile der Jahrhunderte*.' F. Torm *Einführung in das griechische N.T.* L. Koch: 'Rosenberg *Kristenånden*,' No. 4. C. Glarbo: 'Om den historiske Erkendelse af Jesu Person.' V. Lindegaard-Petersen: 'Fransk Kirkeliv i 1909.' F. Buhl: 'Jödiske Papyri fra Elephantine.' L. Koch: 'Lindblom *Senjudiskt fromhetslif enligt Salomos Psaltare*.' L. Bergmann: 'Erslev *Det sektende Aarhundrede*.'

*The Hindustan Review* (Vol. XXI. No. 130. June 1910. Allahabad: 29 Elgin Road). (The late) N. Chattopadhyaya: 'Hindustani as a National Language of India,' II. K. Chandra Kanjilal: 'The Present Moral and Social Condition of the Indians.' S. Z. Ali: 'Some Persian Proverbs and the English Parallels,' II. J. Jamshedji Modi: 'Evidence of Widow-Marriage in Ancient India—from Firdausi.' S. Ranganatha Rao: 'A Study of Hypnotism,' II. Sirdar Madhav Rao V. Kibe: 'The Treatment of Juvenile Offenders in India.' G. Greenwood: 'Cometic Mysteries.' B. S. Kumaraswami Pillai: 'Hygiene v. Medicine,' 'The English Press in India, 1909-10,' II (43 pp.). 'Our new King-Emperor, George V.'

*The Church Missionary Review* (Vol. LXI. Nos. 732-4. April-June 1910. C.M.S.). G. T. Manley: 'The Missionary Message in Relation to Non-Christian Religions.' "Academicus": 'Christian Education in China and the University for China Scheme.' G. A. Bunbury: 'The Training of the Chinese Preacher.' W. V. K. Treanor: 'The Influence of Christianity on the Upper Classes of N. India.' J. F. Hewitt: 'What is Islam?' C. E. Tyndale-Biscoe: 'A Mission-school and Social Service.' 'Wilson-Carmichael *Lotus Buds*.' 'Cary *History of Christianity in Japan*.'



Sharrock *South Indian Missions.* 'J. G. Simpson *Christus Crucifixus.*' May. "Viator": 'Power through Suffering.' F. Baylis: 'The Church in the Mission-field.' Right Rev. H. Evington: 'Mutual Attitude of Missionary and People.' A. V. Prior: 'The Support of Missionary Societies.' W. H. Elwin: 'The Present Opportunity among Chinese Students at Tokyo.' 'Progress of Opium Suppression in China.' 'A. J. Tait *Christ and the Nations.*' G. T. M[anley]: 'Hooton *Turning Points in the Primitive Church.*' June. Bishop of Manchester: 'The Crisis of Christendom and Islam.' C.M.S. Annual Sermon, 1910. T. Bomford: 'Education in Indian Schools.' H. G. Guy: 'Old Truths re-vindicated, II. Atonement.' G. F. S[mith]: 'King W. G. Lawes of *Savage Island and New Guinea.*'

*The East and the West* (Vol. VIII. No. 30. April 1910. S.P.G.). Right Rev. G. L. King (Bishop of Madagascar): 'Do we work on Apostolic Principles?' W. W. Holdsworth: 'The Missionary Motive.' G. White: 'The Relation of Missionary Effort to Social Life from an Australian Standpoint.' R. G. Milburn: 'Alternative Missionary Policies for India.' A. Lloyd: 'Gnosticism in Japan.' F. H. Barrow: 'Hinduism and Mohammedanism in India.' M. N. Trollope: 'Corea.' W. G. Boyd: 'The New Mission in Western Canada.' B. H. Streeter: 'University Education in China.' 'Warneck *The Living Forces of the Gospel*' [E.T.]. 'B. T. Washington *The Story of the Negro.*' 'R. H. Jelf *Life of J. J. Curling.*' 'Barnett-Clarke *Life and Times of Archdeacon Lightfoot.*' 'J. T. Aldridge *A Transformed Colony, Sierra Leone.*' 'J. Ross *The Original Religion of China.*'

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be reviewed in Articles or Short Notices as space permits.

### BIBLICAL STUDIES.

BLACKBURN, G. M. I.—*S. Paul: His Story and his Writings sketched in Outline.* 'Churchman's Penny Library,' No. 30. Pp. 44. (Mowbray). 1d.

CURTIS, E. L. and MADSEN, A. A.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles.* 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. xxii + 534. (T. and T. Clark.) 12s.

DURELL, J. C. V.—*The Self-Revelation of our Lord.* Pp. xxviii + 224. (T. and T. Clark.) 5s. net.

FRIEDLANDER, G.—*The Law of Love in the Old and New Testaments.* Pp. 20. (London: J. Miles and Co., Ltd.) 6d. By the Minister of the London Western Synagogue.

—*The Grace of God illustrated by the Parable of the Prodigal Son in Jewish and Christian Literature: A Study in Comparative Theology.* Pp. 36. (Hugh Rees.) 6d.

GIRDLESTONE, R. B.—*Outlines of Bible Chronology illustrated from External Sources.* Pp. 78. (S.P.C.K.) 2s.

GREEN, RIGHT REV. A. V. (Bishop of Ballarat).—*The Ephesian Canonical Writings. An Elementary Introduction to the Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse commonly attributed to the Apostle John.* 'Moorhouse Lectures,' 1910. Pp. xvi + 252. (Williams and Norgate.) 5s. net.

MACDERMOTT, G. M.—*St. Luke.* 'Plain Commentaries.' Pp. x + 142. (Wells Gardner.) 6d.

MASTERMAN, E. W. G.—*Studies in Galilee.* Pp. xvi + 154. (Chicago University Press.) 4s. 3d. With Preface by Professor George Adam Smith.

MAYOR, J. B.—*The Epistle of St. James.* The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Comments. Third Edition. Pp. xvi + ccxcii + 264. (Macmillan.) 14s. net. With much new matter.



MONTEFIORE, C. G.—*Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels*. Being the Jowett Lectures for 1910. Pp. xii + 172. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d. net.

PETRIE, W. M. FLINDERS.—*The Growth of the Gospels as shewn by Structural Criticism*. Pp. viii + 100. (Murray.) 2s. 6d. net.

RULE, U. Z.—*Old Testament Institutions: Their Origin and Development*. With Preface by A. H. SAYCE. Pp. vi + 448. (S.P.C.K.) 5s.

SKINNER, J.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. lxviii + 552. (T. and T. Clark.) 12s. 6d.

SMYTH, W. W.—*Facts and Fallacies regarding the Bible*. Pp. viii + 192. (Stock.) 3s. 6d. net. Illustrated.

VASSALL-PHILLIPS, O. R.—*Mr. Conybeare on Mark iii 21 and Luke xi 27, 28: Some Positive Methods of a Negative Critic*. Pp. 40. (Oxford: Giles. London: Simpkin, Marshall.) 1s. By a Roman Catholic priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer.

WALES, F. H.—*The Rhythmic Psalter*. Pp. 248. (Frowde.) 3s. 6d. net.

WICKHAM, VERY REV. E. C. (Dean of Lincoln).—*The Epistle to the Hebrews*. With Introduction and Notes. 'Westminster Commentaries.' Pp. xlv + 144. (Methuen.) 6s.

WILLIAMS, A. I.—*Galatians*. With Introduction and Notes. 'Cambridge Greek Testament.' Pp. 1 + 160. (Cambridge University Press.) Defends North Galatian theory. 3s. net.

#### PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND APOLOGETICS.

HUNT, J. B.—*Existence after Death implied by Science*. Pp. 336. (H. R. Allenson.) 5s. net.

KENNETT, R. H.—*The Church's Gain from Modern Thought as shown in Old Testament Study*. Pp. 32. (Longmans.) 6s. net. Paper read to the East-Anglian Clerical Conference at Cambridge.

MATHEWS, S.—*The Gospel and the Modern Man*. 'Haverford Library Lectures.' Pp. xiv + 332. (The Macmillan Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

ORCHARD, H. L.—*The Attitude of Science towards Miracles*. 'Gunning Prize Essay,' 1909. Pp. 44. (London: Victoria Institute.)

TABRUM, A. H.—*Religious Beliefs of Scientists, including one Hundred hitherto unpublished Letters on Science and Religion from eminent Men of Science*. With Introduction by C. L. DRAWBRIDGE. Pp. xvi + 166. (London: Hunter and Longhurst, for the North London Christian Evidence League.) 2s. 6d. net.

#### COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

FRAZER, J. G.—*Totemism and Exogamy. A Treatise on Certain Early Forms of Superstition and Society*. Four Volumes. Pp. xx + 580, x + 640, x + 584, vi + 380. (Macmillan.) 50s. net. With 8 Maps.

#### HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

CLARK, S. H.—*St. Augustine Catholic and Protestant: A Plea for Reunion of the Churches of Christ*. With Prefatory Note by the BISHOP OF DURHAM. Pp. x + 80. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d. By the Vicar of Belper.

COOPER, J., and WOTHERSPOON, H. J.—*The Duty of the Church according to her Lord's Commission*. II. *Doctrine: Papers on the Catholic Faith set forth in the Ancient Creeds embodied in the Public and Avowed Confession of the Church of Scotland*. Pp. 18. (Blackwood.) 1d.

IRWIN, C. K.—*Eternal Punishment. The Teaching of the Church and Holy Scripture upon the Doctrine*. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

- LIAS, J. J.—*The Nicene Creed*. A Manual for the Use of Candidates for Holy Orders. Pp. xx + 444. (Sonnenschein.) 7s. 6d. New edition.
- MACLEANE, D.—*The Battle round a Creed*. Pp. xvi + 56. (Mowbray.) 1s. net.
- SANDAY, W.—*Christologies Ancient and Modern*. Pp. viii + 244. (Clarendon Press.) 6s. net.
- SCOTT, M.—*The Atonement*. Pp. viii + 392. (Allen.) 5s. net.
- TAIT, A. J.—*Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-Nine Articles*. Pp. viii + 238. (Stock.) 3s. net.
- TURNER, C. H. (edited by).—*The Athanasian Creed*. A New Translation drawn up by a Committee appointed by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury in accordance with a Resolution adopted at the Lambeth Conference of 1908. With Latin Text. Pp. 16. 2d.

## METAPHYSICS AND ETHICS.

- COIT, S.—*The Spiritual Nature of Man*. 'Ethical Message' Series, II. Pp. ii + 112. (Bayswater: West London Ethical Society.) 1s. net.
- DOUGLAS, A. H. (the late).—*The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi*. Edited by C. DOUGLAS and R. P. HARDIE. Pp. x + 318. (Cambridge University Press.) 7s. 6d. net.
- WALKER, L. J., S. J.—*Theories of Knowledge: Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism*. 'Stonyhurst Philosophical' Series. Pp. xl + 696. (Longmans.) 9s.

## HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

- BARBER, VEN. E. (Archdeacon of Chester), and DITCHFIELD, P. H.—*Memorials of Old Cheshire*. Pp. xii + 86. (George Allen.) 15s. net. With many illustrations.
- BOND, F.—*Wood Carvings in English Churches*. I. *Misericords*. Pp. xx + 238. (Frowde.) 7s. 6d. net. With 241 Photographs and Drawings.
- BRINCKMAN, A.—*Notes on the Papal Claims*. Pp. viii + 230. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net.
- BROWNE, RIGHT REV. G. F. (Bishop of Bristol).—*Boniface of Crediton and his Companions*. Based on Lectures delivered in the Cathedral Church of Bristol in 1906. Pp. xii + 372. (S.P.C.K.) 6s. With 17 Illustrations.
- CHADWYCK HEALEY, SIR C. E. H.—*Church Property*. Pp. 24. (S.P.C.K.) 2d. Paper read before the Cranleigh Branch of C.E.M.S.
- CORNFORD, M. E.—*Paul's Cross: A History*. Pp. iv + 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d. An interesting little book with copious references and two illustrations.
- DAMPIER, M. G.—*The Organization of the Orthodox Eastern Churches*. Pp. 56. (Mowbray, for the Eastern Church Association.) 1s. net. Very useful.
- DAY, E. HERMITAGE.—*Renaissance Architecture in England*. 'Arts of the Church' Series. Pp. xvi + 174. (Mowbray.) 1s. 6d. net. With 37 illustrations from photographs.
- HAMILTON, M.—*Greek Saints and their Festivals*. Pp. viii + 212. (Blackwood.) 5s. net.
- OMAN, C.—*England before the Norman Conquest*. Being a History of the Celtic, Roman and Anglo-Saxon Periods down to the Year A.D. 1066. Pp. xxii + 680. (Methuen.) 10s. 6d. net. See Short Notice.
- RILEY, A.—*A Synopsis of Oriental Christianity*. 'Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association,' New Series, I. Third Edition. Pp. 10. (Oxford: Parker.) 2d. A very useful little table, first printed in 1888.
- RIVOIRA, G. T.—*Lombardic Architecture: its Origin, Development and Derivatives*. Translated by G. McN. RUSHFORTH. Pp. xii + 252, viii + 368. (Heinemann.) 3 guineas net. Two magnificent volumes with over 800 Illustrations.

SABATIER, P.—*Examen critique des récits concernant la visite de Jacqueline de Settesoli à Saint François*. 'Opuscules de Critique historique,' XV. Pp. iv + 44. (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.) 2 fr. 25.

SHARPE, A. R.—*The Church of England's Seven Ages*. 'Heyford Papers,' No. 10. Pp. 88. (Mowbray.) 3d. net.

STRATFORD, L.—*Edward the Fourth*. 'Makers of National History' Series. Pp. xx + 340. (Pitman.) 3s. 6d. net.

THYNNE, A. C. (the late).—*A Brief History of Kilkhampton Church and Parish*. Second Edition. Pp. vi + 50. (Wells Gardner.) 2s. 6d. net. With Prefatory Note by R. Dew and excellent illustrations.

TREVELYAN, M.—*Llantwit Major: its History and Antiquities*. Pp. xxi + iv + 224. (Newport, Mon.: Southall.) 2s. 6d.

WEIGALL, A. E. P.—*A Guide to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt from Abydos to the Sudan Frontier*. Pp. xxiv + 594. (Methuen.) 7s. 6d. net.

WILKINSON, M.—*The Last Phase of the League in Provence, 1588-1598*. Pp. vi + 84. (Longmans.) 4s. 6d. net.

WILSON, J. M.—*Joan of Arc*. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

#### PRACTICAL AND DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

DE BARY, R.—*Franciscan Days of Vigil. A Narrative of Personal Views and Developments*. Pp. x + 230. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

BODINGTON, C.—*Devotion*. Pp. 56. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

GILLET, G., and PALMER, W. SCOTT.—*The Claims and Promise of the Church*. Pp. iv + 158. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net.

GRIFFIN, W. N.—*Our Heavenly Home, Love Hereafter*. Pp. viii + 64. (Stock.) 2s. 6d. net.

LOCH, C. S.—*Charity and Social Life: A Short Study of Religious and Social Thought in Relation to Charitable Methods and Institutions*. Pp. xii + 496. (Macmillan.) 6s. net.

MONTGOMERY, RIGHT REV. H. H.—*Advice to Churchmen about to emigrate*. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d.

NUNNS, T.—*The Psalms and their Makers*. Pp. xii + 284. (Nutt.) 3s. net.

PROSSER, D. L.—*The Fulness of God. Thoughts at a Quiet Day for Church Workers*. Pp. 48. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

ROMANES, E. G.—*What a Christian should Believe, Know, and Do: a very simple guide to Faith and Practice*. Pp. viii + 198. (Mowbray.) 6d. net.

ROMANES, MRS.—*Thoughts on the Beatitudes*. Pp. iv + 34. (Mowbray.) 4d. net.

VAUGHAN, B., S.J.—*Life Lessons from Blessed Joan of Arc*. With Illustrations by G. BUSSIÈRE and Preface by the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. Pp. xviii + 142. (George Allen and Sons.) 3s. 6d. net.

WEBB, RIGHT REV. W. W. (Bishop of Milwaukee).—*The Cure of Souls: a Manual for the Clergy*. Based chiefly upon English and Oriental Authorities. With Commendatory Preface by BISHOP NICHOLSON. Second Edition. Pp. xxxii + 248. (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co. London: Mowbray.) 6s. net.

*Absente Reo*. By the Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. Pp. xviii + 358. (Macmillan.) 5s. net.

#### SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

BUTLER, H. M.—*I was in prison and ye came unto me*. Pp. 21. (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes.) 1d. Address delivered by the Master of Trinity in St. Michael's Church, Cambridge, May 11, 1910, at a Meeting of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society.

CLARKE, MOST REV. H. L. (Archbishop of Melbourne).—*The Last Things*. A Series of Addresses. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

HICKS, E. L.—*The Christian's Optimism*. A Sermon. 'Christian Social Union' (Manchester Branch). Pp. 8. (Westhoughton: Joynson.) 1d.

INGRAM, RIGHT REV. A. F. W. (Bishop of London).—*The Mysteries of God*. Pp. x + 318. (Wells Gardner.) 1s. net. Mission Addresses, 1910.

#### MISSIONS.

CARUS-WILSON, M. L. G.—*The Expansion of Christendom: A Study in Religious History*. Pp. xxii + 338. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

LONGRIDGE, G.—*A History of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta*. Now completed with an Additional Chapter down to 1909. With a Preface by the BISHOP of SOUTHWARK. Revised and abridged for the second edition by W. H. HUTTON. Pp. xxiv + 222. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net.

MACLEOD, W. H., and MCCALLUM, J. D.—*The Duty of the Church according to her Lord's Commission. The Evangelisation of the World. The Present Call*. Pp. 16. (Blackwood.) 1d.

MONTGOMERY, H. B.—*Western Women in Eastern Lands: An Outline Study of Fifty Years of Woman's Work in Foreign Missions*. Pp. xiv + 286. (The Macmillan Co.) 2s. net.

RICE, W. A.—*Crusaders of the Twentieth Century or the Christian Missionary and the Muslim*. An Introduction to Work among Muhammadans. Pp. 1 + 512. (C.M.S. for the Author.) 5s. post free.

*Report of the Year 1909 of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*. Pp. xxviii + 276 + xi. (S.P.G.)

#### EDUCATION.

HODGSON, G. E.—*Education: Religious or Moral?* 'All Saints,' Clifton, Pamphlets, No. 1. Pp. 32. (Bristol: W. C. Hemmons.) 1d. Paper read to the Clifton Branch of the E.C.U., March 1910.

RENNIE, J.—*The Aims and Methods of Nature Study*. A Guide for Teachers. Pp. xvi + 352. (W. B. Clive.) A very interesting little book with an Introduction by Prof. J. Arthur Thomson of Aberdeen.

*Towards Educational Peace. A Plan of Re-settlement in English Elementary Education issued by the Executive Committee of the Educational Settlement Committee*. Pp. 60. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

#### LITURGICA AND MUSIC.

MAITLAND, J. A. F.—*Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Vol. V. T.-Z. and Appendix. Pp. viii + 672. (Macmillan.) 21s. net.

STALEY, VERY REV. V. (Provost of Inverness).—*The Minor Holy Days of the Calendar of the Book of Common Prayer*. 'Churchman's Penny Library,' No. 29. Pp. 42. (Mowbray.) 1d.

#### TOPOGRAPHY AND TRAVEL.

PONTING, H. G.—*In Lotus-land Japan*. Pp. xvi + 396. (Macmillan.) 21s. net. With 8 splendid illustrations in Colour and 96 in Monochrome.

SHORTER, C. L.—*Highways and Byways in Buckinghamshire*. Pp. xx + 344. (Macmillan.) 6s. Illustrated by F. L. Griggs.

#### CLASSICAL AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

GARDINER, E. N.—*Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. Pp. xxviii + 534. (Macmillan.) 10s. 6d.

HOLLINS, D.—*The Quest: a Drama of Deliverance*. In Seven Scenes and a Vision. Pp. xii + 116. (Williams and Norgate.) 4s. 6d. net.





## INDEX TO VOL. LXX.

---

- AIYAR, Mr. S. KAILASAM, *The Present Situation in India*, 473
- Archbishops of St. Andrews, *The* (by J. Herkless and R. K. Hannay), 234
- AUSTIN, Mr. ALFRED, *The Bridling of Pegasus : Prose Papers on Poetry*, 485
- BEECHING, Rev. Dr. H. C., *Francis Atterbury*, 230
- BENSON, Miss MARGARET, *The Venture of Rational Faith*, 191
- BIBLICAL TEACHING ON DIVORCE, THE [by the Rev. C. W. Emmet], 154 *sqq.*: preliminary survey, 155; Old Testament teaching on divorce, 156; that of Malachi, Ezra, and Josephus, 157; Mosaic regulations, 158; *beena* marriages, 159; views of our Lord on divorce, 160 *sq.*; Professor Burkitt quoted, 162; did our Lord allow remarriage? 163 *sq.*; critical arguments on the text of St. Matthew, 165 *sq.*; attitude of 'higher critics,' 167; references by St. Paul, 168 *sq.*; Father Puller quoted, 170; Old and New Testament teaching compared, 172; the woman's side of the question, 173 *sq.*; M. Loisy quoted, 175; woman treated as subordinate of man by St. Paul, 176; principles to be sought, 178; Lambeth Conference Report, 179
- BOOKS RECEIVED, 249, 495
- Box, Rev. G. H., *A Short Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 186
- BÜCHLER, Dr. A., *The Political and the Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sephoris in the Second and Third Centuries*, 447
- BURNEY, Rev. Dr. C. F., *Israel's Hope of Immortality*, 185
- BUTCHER, Dean, *The Sound of a Voice that is still*, 209
- Cambridge History of English Literature, The*, Vol. IV. (ed. by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller), 483
- Cambridge Modern History, The*, Vol. VI., 464
- CARNEGIE, Rev. W. H., *Churchmanship and Character*, 209
- CHADWICK, Rev. Dr. W. E., *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity; The Social Principles of the Gospel*, 475
- CHAILLEY, M. JOSEPH, *Administrative Problems of British India* [trans. by Sir W. Meyer, K.C.I.E.], 472
- CHRISTIANITY, SCIENCE, AND 'CHRISTIAN SCIENCE' [by Dr. Harrington Sainsbury], 63 *sqq.*: origins of science, 64; primary conceptions of the 'pneuma,' 65; what is the doctrine of the 'pneuma'? 66; relation between soma and pneuma, 67; examination of material processes, 68; and of morbid processes, 69

- sq.*; sin and sickness classed together by Christian Scientists, 71; health and disease represent separate harmonies, 72; reality of objective world, 73; doctrine of material world held by Christian Scientists, 74; the subjective element in nature, 76; psyche merges into the physical, 77; psychic factors examined, 78; the state of hysteria, 79; hypnotism and mesmerism, 80; hypnotic suggestion as a force, 81; is science incompatible with Christian belief? 82; possibilities of Faith Cure, 83 *sq.*; conditions necessary to proof of Faith Cure, 85; function of psychotherapy, 86; the Emmanuel Church movement, 88
- CONNOLLY, Dom R. H., *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, 459
- COURTHOPE, Mr. W. J., *A History of English Poetry*, 481
- Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. by Rev. Dr. J. Hastings), 180
- DUTHIE, Rev. D. WALLACE, *A Bishop in the Rough*, 213
- DYKE, Mr. HENRY VAN, *Le Génie de l'Amérique*, 215
- DYKES, Rev. Dr. J. OSWALD, *The Church Minister and his Duties*, 211
- EDE, Very Rev. Dr. W. MOORE, *The Clergy and Social Service*, 475
- EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA [by Rev. A. G. B. West], 290 *sqq.*: religious instruction not recognized in State schools, 291; Dr. Pain's New South Wales system, 291 *sq.*; Archbishop Benson's ideal, 292; 'The Bible in State Schools League,' 293; political wire-pulling at work, 294; attitude of Roman Catholicism towards State schools, 295; denominational foundations taken over by State, 296; position and prospects of the school teacher, 297; secondary education, 298; standard of teaching, 299 *sq.*; a central public school required, 301; importance attached to technical instruction, 302; the University system, 303; medical schools, 304; residence in college, *ib.*
- Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (ed. by Rev. Dr. J. Hastings), 197
- Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* (ed. by F. G. Stokes), 466
- EUCARIST IN HISTORY, THE, [by Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D.], 29 *sqq.*: Dr. Stone's point of view, 30; aim and method of his book, 31; teaching of Bishop Pearson, 32; Berengarian controversy, 33; views of St. Thomas Aquinas, 34; of Zwingli, 34 *sq.*; shortcomings in Dr. Stone's work, 36; Tractarian point of view, 37; review in *Expository Times*, 38; criticism by the *Record* and *Times*, 38 *sq.*; Axel Andersen, 40; Sir William Ramsay on formula used at Last Supper, 41 *sq.*; summary of Hooker's views, 43; what represents the original account of the rite? 45; the relation between the Passover and the Last Supper, 46; what the Passover meant to a Jew, 47; interpretation of the Eucharist, 48 *sq.*; Johannes Hoffmann quoted, 50 *sq.*; meaning attached to the Eucharist by St. Paul, 52; words used at Last Supper imply a sacrificial rite, 53; Dr. Schweitzer on sacramental acts, 54; teaching of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 55 *sq.*; the early Church recognized the

- spiritual in the material, 58 ; what is the orthodox teaching about the Eucharist? 59 ; the essential element in the fulfilment of a command, 60 ; Bishop of Birmingham and the Commission on Ritual, 61 ; duty of the Church regarding sacraments, 62
- EVERETT, Rev. Dr. C. C., *Theism and the Christian Faith: Lectures delivered in the Harvard Divinity School*, 449
- FAUNCE, Dr. W. H. P., *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry*, 211
- FOLEY, Rev. Dr. G. C., *Anselm's Theory of the Atonement*, 204
- FORSYTH, Rev. Dr. P. T., *Missions in State and Church*, 208
- FRANÇAIS, M. J., *L'Eglise et la Sorcellerie*, 469
- FRERE, Rev. Dr. W. H. : see 'Training and Examination of Candidates for Orders'
- GALLOWAY, Dr. GEORGE, *The Principles of Religious Development: A Psychological and Philosophical Study*, 450
- HABERSHON, Miss ADA R., *The Bible and the British Museum*, 185
- HALL, Right Rev. Dr. A. C. A. (Bishop of Vermont), *The Doctrine of the Church*, 203
- HALL, Rev. Dr. FRANCIS J., *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology; Authority, Ecclesiastical and Biblical; The Being and Attributes of God*, 202
- HEADLAM, Rev. Dr. A. C., *History, Authority and Theology*, 192
- HEDIN, Dr. SVEN, *Trans-Himalaya: Discoveries and Adventures in Thibet*, 228
- HOLDICH, Col. Sir THOMAS, *The Gates of India*, 473
- HOLMES, Rev. E. E., *Immortality*, 195
- HOW WE MAY 'THINK OF THE TRINITY' [by the Rev. Robert Vaughan], 117 *sqq.* : doctrine of the Holy Trinity, 117 *sq.* ; terminological difficulty, 119 ; ability of the mind to grasp the complex, 120 ; what constitutes 'personality'? 121 *sq.* ; three distinct consciousnesses in the Trinity, 123 ; Personality of the Son, 124 ; of the Holy Ghost, 125 ; Le Bon's *Evolution of Matter*, 126 ; simultaneity of the Persons in the Godhead, 127 ; meaning of Immanence, 128 ; Universality of the Godhead, 129 ; Immanence may admit of antagonism, 130 ; teaching of Plato on the Idea, 131 ; limitation in Immanence, 132 *sq.* ; the Incarnation, 133 ; limitations of, 134 ; Personality of Jesus, 135 ; thoughts on miracles, 136 ; the Trinity is indivisible, 137
- INGE, Rev. Dr. W. R., *Faith and its Psychology*, 188
- JONES, Dr. HENRY, *The Working Faith of a Social Reformer*, 475
- JONES, Mr. F. A., *The Dates of Genesis*, 183
- JORDAN, Rev. Dr. W. G., *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought, or The Place of the Old Testament Documents in the Life of To-day*, 184
- JUGIE, M., *Histoire du Canon de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise Grecque et l'Eglise Russe*, 182
- KELLY, Rev. HERBERT : see 'Training and Examination of Candidates for Orders'
- KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, THE MODERN CONCEPTION OF THE, 305 *sqq.* : our Lord's threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and



- King, 306; the crucifixion regarded as a symbol, 307; transvaluation of values, 308; St. Paul's teaching on the Personality of Christ, 309; Church doctrine regarding nature of Kingdom, 310 *sq.*; faith the first essential in grasping the Kingdom of Heaven, 312; its reality, 313; different functions of philosophy and natural science, 314; meaning of 'Thy Kingdom come,' 315; the prophetic function of our Lord, 316; materialistic tendency in popular literature, 317; why should the Super-Man be evolved, 318; sanctification of the material, 319; human development and its limitations, 320; Jesus Christ the unifying element in the Kingdom of Heaven, *ib.*; the idea of this life as an exile, 321; progress and rest in the Kingdom, 322 *sq.*; earthly embodiment of the Kingdom, 324; communion with the unseen, 325; our Lord's teaching regarding the future life, 326
- KING EDWARD THE SEVENTH, 257 *sqq.*: secret of his influence, 257; his power of enjoyment, 258; his effectiveness, 259; difficulty of position, 260; influence of heredity and circumstances, 261; thoroughness one of King Edward's characteristics, 262; political situation at time of his death, 264; King George V, 264 *sq.*
- LEGER, Mr. A. St., *Australian Socialism — An Historical Sketch of its Origin and Developments*, 215
- LEISHMAN, Rev. J. F., *A Son of Knox and other Studies Antiquarian and Biographical*, 236
- LEROY, Père HIPPOLYTE, *Jésus-Christ : Sa Vie, Son Temps*, 207
- LOMBROSO, Prof. CESARE, *After Death, What ?* (trans. by William Sloane Kennedy), 455
- LONG, Mr. JAMES, *The Coming Englishman*, 215
- MACFIE, Mr. R. C., *Science and Immortality*, 452
- MACMILLAN, Rev. Dr. D., *The Aberdeen Doctors*, 236
- Memorials of Old Staffordshire* (ed. by Rev. W. Beresford), 223
- Memorials of Old Yorkshire* (ed. by Mr. T. M. Fallow), 226
- Metaphysica Fratris Rogeri de Viciis Contractis in Studio Theologie* (ed. by Mr. Robert Steele), 458
- METHODISM, A NEW HISTORY OF [by the Rev. Dr. E. W. Watson], 1 *sqq.*: official sanction to publication of 'John Wesley's Journals,' 2; difficulties in preparation for press, 3; home influence on John Wesley, 4; his correspondence with Miss Betty Kirkham, 5; his admiration for William Law, 6; teaching of Lord Chancellor King, 7; Wesley's efficiency as an evangelist, 8; his superstition and patriotism, 9; John Haime quoted, 10; Lisbon earthquake: effect on religious thought, 11; Wesley's experience as chaplain on emigrant ship, 12; his genius stimulated his helpers, 13; hostility to and success of open-air preaching, 14; constitution of first English Society, 15; membership of the Society, 16; itinerant preachers: their place in the movement, 17; circuit organization, 18; great interest taken in future sphere of work of ministers, 19; Wesleyan shrinking from formal

separation, 20 ; disappearance of unpaid local volunteers, 21 ; Wesley was intensely conservative, 22 ; Methodism and politics, 23 ; Jabez Bunting and Hugh Bourne, 24 ; Methodism in United States, 25 ; emotionalism of Wesleyans, 26 ; their use of the Book of Common Prayer, 27 ; Dr. Workman's book, 28

*Ministry of the Church of England, The*, 210

MORLEY, Viscount, *Indian Speeches*, 473

MURRAY, Prof. GILBERT, *The Iphigenia in Tauris of Euripides*, 479

*Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (ed. by Rev. W. C. Piercy), 180

NIEUWBARN, Rev. M. C., *The Holy Sacrifice and its Ceremonies : An Explanation of its Mystical and Liturgical Meaning*, 205

NOEL, Rev. CONRAD, *Socialism in Church History*, 475

NOVELS OF MR. HENRY JAMES, THE, 400 sqq. ; characterization in Mr. James' work, 402 ; development of his style, 403 ; opposition of New World and Old, 404 ; *Roderick Hudson*, *ib.* ; Mrs. Beecher-Stowe, 405 ; *Portrait of a Lady*, 406 ; *The Europeans*, 407 ; *Daisy Miller*, *ib.* ; French counterparts of *Daisy Miller*, *ib.* ; *The Bostonians*, 408 ; *What Maisie Knew*, 409 ; affinity between Mr. James and Nathaniel Hawthorne, *ib.* ; *The Wings of the Dove*, 410 ; *The Ambassadors*, 411 sq. ; *The American Scene*, 413

OESTERLEY, Rev. Dr. W. O. E., *Codex Taurinensis* (Y.), 488

OMAN, Mr. CHARLES, *England before the Norman Conquest*, 461

PASTORAL THEOLOGY, FOREIGN AND ENGLISH SCHOOLS OF, 138 sqq. : materials for a science of Pastoral Theology, 139 sq. ; work of German school, 141 ; place of Roman Catholic and Lutheran writers, 142 ; Anglican field of work, 143 ; influence of Cranmer, 144 ; Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 145 ; Herbert's *A Priest to the Temple, or Country Parson*, 146 ; Burnet's *Discourse of the Pastoral Care*, 147 sq. ; *The Clergyman's Instructor*, 149 ; the agent in Pastoral Theology, 151 ; as a student, *ib.* ; as a manager, 152 ; as a missionary, 153

PEAKE, Rev. Dr. ARTHUR S., *Christianity, its Nature and its Truth*, 196

PERIODICALS, 239, 486

PLUMMER, Rev. Dr. ALFRED, *The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 463

POPE GREGORY VII AND THE HILDEBRANDINE IDEAL [by Rev. J. P. Whitney, D.C.L.], 414 sqq. : Prof. Maitland's *Domesday Book and Beyond*, 415 ; changes in the character of the episcopate, 416 ; secular patronage instituted, 417 ; simony prevalent in France, 417 sq. ; secularization of Church in Germany, 418 ; Gregory VI and Clement II, 419 ; Hildebrand in exile with Gregory VI, *ib.* ; the Clugny revival, 420 ; Bonitho, Bishop of Sutri, 421 ; supporters of reform at Ravenna and Bologna, 422 ; Decretals of Isidore, 423 ; Wazo, Bishop of Lüttich, 424 ; activity of Leo IX, *ib.* ; conflict between Henry III and the Pope, 426 ; theory of canonical election, 427 ; various offices held by Hildebrand, 428 ; his power in Rome, 429 ; Cardinal



Humbert, *ib.*; St. Peter Damiani, 430; Humbert and Damiani contrasted, 431; Hildebrand becomes Pope as Gregory VII, 432; his attitude towards Berengar, 432 *sq.*; Lampert of Hersfeld, 433 *sq.*; influence of Gregory VII on German affairs, 435; civil strife in Milan, *ib.*; Leo IX at Rheims, 436; Papal policy in England, 437; two factors that assisted Gregory VII in government, 438; violent scenes in Mainz and Erfurt, 439; decree against lay-investiture, 440; Cardinal Hugh the White at Worms, 441; Henry IV excommunicated, 442; Gregory and Henry at Canossa, 442; quarrel between Henry and Rudolf, 443; Rome besieged, 444; summary of Gregory's policy, 445

RASHDALL, Rev. Dr. H., *Philosophy and Religion*, 187

RATING OF TITHE RENT-CHARGE ATTACHED TO A BENEFICE, THE, 381 *sqq.*: Boyle's *Law of Rating* quoted, 382; difference of assessment in tithe rent-charges and house taxation, *ib.*; personalty often escapes taxation, 383; Tithe-Rates Relief Act, 384; Cannan's *History of Local Rates*, *ib.*; Elizabethan Act for Relief of the Poor, 385; owner of tithe should be taxed as an 'inhabitant,' 386; Dalton's *Country Justice* quoted, *ib.*; Commission on Local Taxation in 1899, 387; Sir John Graham's committee, 388; Parochial Assessments Act, 389; Report on Local Taxation, *ib.*; *Rex v. Trustees of the Duke of Bridgwater*, 390; *Rex v. Joddrell*, *ib.*; is stock-in-trade rateable? 391; should a deduction be allowed before

taxing tithe values? 392; Mr. Asquith on local and national taxation, 393; Sir J. T. Hilbert, 394; Lord Chancellor Selborne, *Defence of the Church*, 395; tithe owners suffer by being taxed on gross income, 396 *sq.*; Brodrick, *English Lands and Landlords*, 397; Sir Robert Peel, 398; Mr. Gladstone's views, 399; need of combination to protect clerical interests, 400

*Religion and the Modern Mind*, 'St. Ninian Lectures,' 199

REUNION AND THE CHURCHES OF SCANDINAVIA [by Rev. G. C. RICHARDS], 265 *sqq.*: Hugo Grotius, Swedish Ambassador to French court, 266; his plans for Protestant union, 267 *sq.*; Bishop Svedberg and Delaware River colony, 269; the Augustana Synod organized at Chicago, 270; royal mandate for Confirmation at Gothenburg, 270 *sq.*; Bishop Whitehouse of Illinois consecrates church at Stockholm, 272; letter of Archbishop of Upsala, 273; conference of English and Swedish prelates at Upsala, 274; apostolic succession in Swedish Church, 275; attitude of King John III, 276; rite of Confirmation in Sweden, 277 *sq.*; the Real Presence taught, 278; Form for Consecration of a Bishop discussed, 279; the Reformation in Sweden, 280 *sq.*; Denmark and Sweden compared, 282; *Dogmatics* of Bishop Martensen, 283 *sq.*; Dr. Madsen, Primate of Denmark, 285; establishment in Denmark and Sweden, 286 *sq.*; English overtures towards union: difficulties to be met, 288; Bishop Gaul quoted, 289

*Reunion : the Necessary Requirements of the Church of Scotland*, 236

SCREENS AND ROODLOFTS, 89 *sqq.*: early historical summary, 90 *sq.*; rood-beam of Leo III in old St. Peter's, 92; the colonnade and triple arch, 93; Mr. Francis Bond on origin of mediaeval quire screen, 94; use and effect of screens in a church, 96; introduction of lofts, 97; pulpitum and singing galleries, 98; altar veils and cancelli, 100; apertures in panels of screens, 101; synopsis of *Roodscreens and Roodlofts*, 103; sacrilege and restorations, 104; painted tympana, 105; Elizabethan order to demolish roodlofts, 106; Bishop Cosin's screen in Durham Cathedral, 107; altar rails, 108; altar-screen or reredos, 109; painted panels at Ashton, Whitford, and Plymtree, 110; Rev. T. Mozley and Cardinal Morton, 111; various emblems depicted on screens, 113; saints most frequently represented, 115 *sq.*

SEABURY, Rev. Dr. W. J., *Memoirs of Bishop Seabury*, 232

SHEEPSHANKS, Right Rev. JOHN, D.D. (Bishop of Norwich), *The Pastor and his Parish*, 213

SIMPSON, Rev. Dr. J. G., *Christus Crucifixus*, 206

SIMPSON, Rev. PATRICK CARNEGIE, *The Life of Principal Rainy*, 236

SOUTER, Dr., *The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul : The Problem of its Restoration*, 186

SPROTT, Rev. T. H., *Modern Study of the Old Testament and Inspiration*, 184

STAUDT, Dr. CALVIN KLOPP, *The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period*, 194

STODDART, Miss JANE T., *The New Socialism : An Impartial Inquiry*, 215

STRONG, Very Rev. Dr. T. B.: see 'Training and Examination of Candidates for Orders'

TAIT, Rev. A. J.: see 'Training and Examination of Candidates for Orders'

*Temple Dictionary of the Bible, The* (ed. by Rev. W. Ewing and Rev. Dr. J. E. H. Thomson), 180

TIXERONT, M. J., *Histoire des Dogmes. II. De Saint Athanasie à Saint Augustin*, 204

TRAINING AND EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS, 326 *sqq.*: preliminary survey, 327; particular personal interests, 328; essential duties of the parson, 329; Universities' Preliminary Examination, 330; value of textual and grammatical criticism, 331; suggested outlines for Bishop's Examination, 332; shortage of candidates for ordination, 333; the Church's financial responsibility for training, 334; a special Diocesan Fund suggested, 335; educational side of the question, 336; is the period at a Theological College sufficient? 337; men who require financial help, 338 *sq.*; the Kelham system, 340; men who receive their call late in life, 341; missionary studentship, 342; Bishop's Examinations are unsatisfactory, 343; co-ordination wanted in testing candidates, 344; Archbishop of Canterbury's committee of investigation, 344 *sq.*; development of university education, 346;



- should the non-graduate system be abolished? 347; functions of a Theological College, 348 *sq.*; the Diaconate as a preparatory office, 349; material at the disposal of the Church, 350; changed circumstances must be met, 351; the educational point of view is one of three-fold intensity, 352; religious experience and psychology, 353; the position the clergy must face, 354; criticism of theological training, 355; historical and doctrinal subjects, 356; clerical work in a parish, 357; the non-religious man is the one to be reached, 358 *sq.*; defects of our theological position and method, 360; human interests are diverse, 361; need of reform emphasized, 363 *sq.*; is there any alternative to the University course? 365
- TYRRELL, Dr. R. Y., *Essays on Greek Literature*, 480
- WILKINSON, Mr. MAURICE, *The Last Phase of the League in Provence*, 468
- WOMEN'S CHARTER, THE, 367 *sqq.*: widening sphere of women, 367; Lady McLaren, *The Women's Charter of Rights and Liberties*, 368; infantile mortality, 369; suggestions regarding washing and cooking: municipal kitchens, 370; question of divorce discussed, 371 *sq.*; infanticide and its penalties, 372; is legislation capable of meeting economic difficulties? 373; women as members of municipal bodies, 374; as health visitors, 375; Mrs. Bosanquet's views on poor relief, *ib.*; Archbishop of York quoted, 376; suggested alteration in marriage service, 377; Dr. Johnson quoted, 378; enmity between the sexes, 379; Felicia Skene and Father Dolling, 381
- WRIXON, Sir HENRY, *The Religion of the Common Man*, 201
- WULFF, Dr. OSKAR, *Königliche Museen zu Berlin: Beschreibung der Bildwerke der christlichen Epochen, I*, 221
- YEATMAN, Mr. LEWYS L., *The Law relating to Ecclesiastical Discipline over the Clergy of the Church of England*, 219